This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

WORKS

OF

SAMUEL PARR, LL.D.

PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S, CURATE OF HATTON, &c.

WITH

MEMOIRS OF HIS LIFE AND WRITINGS,

AND

A SELECTION FROM HIS CORRESPONDENCE,

BY

JOHN JOHNSTONE, M.D.

FELLOW OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY, AND OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF LONDON, &c.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN, AND GREEN,

PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1828.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

J. B. NICHOLS AND SON, 25, PARLIAMENT-STREET.

CONTENTS OF VOL III.

	Page.
Notice of Dr. Combe's Horace . . .	1
Prefatio ad Bellendeni Libros . . .	81
Miscellaneous Remarks on Politics, Jurisprudence, Morals, &c.	211
Letter from Irenopolis to the Inhabitants of Eleutheropolis	299
Warburtonian Tracts	347
Letter to the Rev. Dr. Milner . . .	425
Extracts from a pamphlet published in answer to Dr. Combe's statement respecting his Variorum Horace.	465
Notes on Rapin's Dissertation on Whigs and Tories	529

NOTICE

OF

Q. HORATII FLACCI OPERA,

Cum variis Lectionibus, notis Variorum, et Indice locupletissimo. Tom. II. Londini.

When this splendid edition of Horace was first presented to our view, we exclaimed, in the words of Catullus,

—— "Chartæ regiæ, novi libri,
Novi umbilici, lora rubra, membrana
Directa plumbo, et pumice omnia æquata."

The brightness of the paper, the amplitude of the margin, and the elegance of the type displayed in this work, are nearly unrivalled. They do honour to the taste and liberality of the editors. They show that, by encouragement and exertion, the art of printing is in a high and progressive state of improvement, and we are confident that many of our readers will be eager to purchase an edition which has so many recommendations from novelty and magnificence.

A variorum edition of Horace has been long among the desiderata of literature, and therefore great commendation is due to the enterprizing spirit which produced the work now under our considera-

tion. It is well known that scholars of the first eminence have often been employed in preparing editions of this kind. Among other instances, we are indebted to J. G. Grævius for the variorum editions of Justin and Suetonius; to J. F. Gronovius for those of Plautus and Livy; to Peter Burman for those of Quintilian and Ovid. But similar publications have often been undertaken with zeal, and executed with success, by persons of less intellectual prowess, and less literary celebrity, than the critics whom we have just now enumerated. If an editor unites a large share of accuracy even with a moderate portion of erudition; if he collects materials with industry, and uses them with judgment; if he distinguishes between ingenuity and refinement, and separates useful information from ostentatious pedantry, he will have a claim to public favour, though he should not possess the exquisite taste of a Heyne, the profound erudition of a Hemsterhuis, or the keen penetration of a Porson.

The writings of Horace are familiar to us from our earliest boyhood. They carry with them attractions which are felt in every period of life, and almost every rank of society. They charm alike by the harmony of the numbers, and the purity of the diction. They exhilarate the gay and interest the serious, according to the different kinds of subjects upon which the poet is employed. Professing neither the precision of analysis, nor the copiousness of system, they have advantages, which, among the ordinary classes of writers, analysis and system rarely attain. They exhibit human imperfections

as they really are, and human excellence as it practically ought to be. They develope every principle of the virtuous in morals, and describe every modification of the decorous in manners. They please without the glare of ornament, and they instruct without the formality of precept. They are the produce of a mind enlightened by study, invigorated by observation; comprehensive, but not visionary; delicate, but not fastidious; too sagacious to be warped by prejudice, and too generous to be cramped by suspicion. They are distinguished by language adapted to the sentiment, and by effort proportioned to the occasion. They contain elegance without affectation, grandeur* without bombast, satire without buffoonery, and philosophy without jargon.

Hence it is that the writings of Horace are more extensively read, and more clearly understood, than those of almost any other classical author. The explanation of obscure passages, and the discussion of conjectural readings, form a part of the education which is given in our public schools. The merits of commentators, as well as of the poet himself, are the subjects of our conversation; and Horace, like our own countryman Shakspeare, has conferred celebrity upon many a scholar, who has been able to adjust his text, or to unfold his allusions.

The works of some Roman, and more Greek writers, are involved in such obscurity, that no lite-

* We use the word Grandeur, because we think that Horace is seldom sublime. Under the article Grandeur, in the British Encyclopædia, our readers will find the distinction between grandeur and sublimity stated with great perspicuity and precision.

rary adventurer should presume to publish a variorum edition of them, unless he has explored the deepest recesses of criticism. But in respect to Horace, every man of letters knows where information is to be had, and every man of judgment will feel little difficulty in applying it to useful and even ornamental purposes.

Of such a writer as Horace, such an edition as that which has lately appeared may be well supposed to have excited a considerable share of public curiosity. We mean, therefore, to bestow more than a common degree of attention upon the contents of the present work, and we shall endeavour to conduct our enquiry in such a manner as will not expose us to the imputation of undistinguishing praise, or acrimonious censure.

The edition now offered to the public bears at first view the name of Dr. Combe only. The Dr. however, informs us that his late friend Mr. Homer had some * concern in the beginning of his task; but we could wish that the Dr. had been pleased to favour us with a more particular account of the share which really belonged to Mr. Homer; and this wish is suggested to us by motives, not of idle curiosity, but of substantial justice. We mean not to depreciate the abilities, or to arraign the sincerity of Dr. Combe. But we have weighty reasons for supposing, and no contemptible authority even for asserting, that the work was chiefly planned by Mr. Homer, that he had procured and arranged ma-

* The Doctor's brief expression is, Mecum hancce operam *inceperat*.

terials nearly for the whole, and that jointly with Dr. C. he superintended the execution, till the fourth book of the Odes was far advanced in the press.

Prefixed to the first volume is an admirable engraving of the late Earl of Mansfield, with this motto subjoined to it:

> "Virtutis veræ custos. ——
> Quo multæ magnæque secantur judice lites."

Now a critic, without the imputation of fastidiousness, might pronounce it rather unusual to compliment the same person in words so remote from each other; for the first passage is to be found in the first Epistle, and the second in the 16th Epistle of Horace. He might doubt how far Lord Mansfield could with propriety be called "Virtutis veræ Custos," according to the sense in which Horace originally wrote the expression about himself; and to the vague application of it, either to the judicial or the political character of Lord M. he might oppose many pertinent and formidable objections. Remembering the occasion upon which the second line was written, he might be led, by a very natural association of ideas, to suspect that an enemy of the noble Lord would pursue to his disadvantage the very quotation which Dr. Combe had begun for the purpose of doing him honour. We cannot ourselves forget a very unfortunate introduction of a part of the passage in the House of Commons;* and we were, as Plautus says, oculati testes, of the ridicu-

* By Mr. C-n-w-y.

lous effect produced by the statement of the whole in a literary company. For the satisfaction then of Dr. C. and the vindication of ourselves, we will lay before our readers the words of Horace:

—— "Vir bonus est quis?
Qui consulta patrum, qui leges juraque servat,
Quo multæ magnæque secantur judice lites;
Quo res sponsore,* et quo causæ teste tenentur;
SED videt hunc omnis domus, et vicinia tota
Introrsus turpem, speciosum pelle decorâ."

That Lord Mansfield deserved the commendation rather than the censure implied in these lines, and that Dr. Combe had, what he would call a right, to separate the one from the other, we readily allow. But we contend that an encomiast, uniting wariness with taste, would have been deterred from selecting any line in *such* a passage, for the description of a person whom he meant to hold up to admiration. They who read a part may remember the whole; and among those who remember the whole may be found prejudiced and mischievous persons, who will admit the suitableness of the verse which the Dr. has applied, and then proceed to apply the context, which the Dr. has overlooked, or forgotten, or defied.

The dedication to Lord Mansfield is written in Latinity almost† unexceptionable. We learn from

* We follow the reading of Cuningham; but, in most editions, it is printed Responsore.

† We say almost, because Lord M. is called "ob multiplicem et exquisitam eruditionem spectatissimus." This we think a very unauthorized use of the word spectatus. It answers (as Dr. C. may learn from the dictionary of Forcellinus) to cognitus, exploratus, probatus, δοκιμασθεὶς, (misprinted in Forcellinus δοκιμασθὴς.) Homo in rebus judicandis spectatus et cognitus. Cic. Orat. in Verrem, lib. ii. In perfecto et spectato viro, Cic. de amicitiâ, sect. ii. Utebatur medico ignobili, sed spectato

it, that the noble Lord was "ob multiplicem et exquisitam eruditionem spectatissimus," that he was "ob benignos et suavissimos mores admodùm diligendus," that in eloquence he surpassed all his contemporaries in the Senate, as well as at the Bar, that with great fame he joined great titles, and that he was the Mæcenas of Dr. Combe. Much in this panegyric is said with truth, and all is said with some degree of elegance. But, while we commend Dr. C. for what he has done in the way of dedication, we must not conceal from our readers what Mr. Homer intended to do. If that judicious and diligent scholar had been living, the illustrious names of Mr. Windham and Mr. Burke would have adorned the page in which we now find the venerable name of Lord Mansfield; and the Dedication itself would

homine Cleophanto. Cic. pro Cluentio. Applied to things, it answers to insignis, nobilis, pulcher. Aulus Gellius, indeed, lib. xiii. cap. 21. writes thus: T. Castricius rhetoricæ disciplinæ doctor, qui habuit Romæ locum principem declamandi ac docendi, summâ vir auctoritate gravitateque, et à Divo Hadriano *in mores atque literas spectatus*. But we observe, first, that the style of Aulus Gellius is not famous for its purity, nor well adapted to panegyric. Secondly, that the phraseology of *spectatus in mores* is very singular. Thirdly, that *mores* is joined with *literas*. Fourthly, that Hadrian, the person approving, is mentioned as well as Castricius, the person approved; and, lastly, that Castricius professed and practised the art of rhetoric, and therefore that his knowledge of that art could be ascertained. Upon the whole, then, a person may be called Spectatus, for his moral qualities displayed in practice, for his skill in the exercise of arts, or his probity and judgment in the conduct of business, as brought to the test of *experience*. But for the mere *acquisition*, or the mere *possession*, or even the mere *display* of learning, no man, we believe, is styled Spectatus by the pure writers of Latin. We shall just observe by the way, that Gesner refers in his Thesaurus to the 20th chapter of Aulus Gellius, instead of the 21st; and, indeed, his numerical references are often erroneous.

have been written by a person, the whole force of whose mind would have been exerted upon such an occasion, and whose advice, during the earlier stages of this publication, was repeatedly asked, and generally followed, by Mr. Henry Homer.

To the Dedication succeeds the Preface, containing three pages. The Editor there tells us, that among the numerous and splendid* editions of Horace, no one has yet appeared with the variorum notæ; that in this new edition care has been taken to assist the studies of scholars, and to adorn the libraries of collectors, by the introduction of such notes as are approved for their utility by the docti judices; that Baxter's edition, republished by Gesner,† has been preferred by the editor in his choice of a text; that this choice was made on account of the accuracy of Gesner's text, and the excellence of the notes; and that the text of the Variorum Edition uniformly follows that of Baxter, except in passages manifestly corrupted by the blunders of printers. Upon this assertion we beg leave to remark, that the text of the Variorum, in many places not *so* corrupted, by no means corresponds to the text of Baxter, and that the want of correspondence is to be imputed, sometimes, it should seem, to inadvertency, and sometimes to design. We shall hereafter support this general position by the detail of particular proofs.

* Dr. Combe's words are, Quamvis et eruditione et ornamentis summis nonnullæ abundant.

† Gesner's edition of Baxter was first published at Gottingen, in 1757; and afterwards at Leipsic, in 1772. The catalogue of Var. Edit. notices the last.

Dr. C. proceeds to inform us, that the notes produced from other authors belong "vel ad explicationem vel ad rem criticam, aliis in quibus vel de re mythologicâ vel historicâ agitur, et quæ ubique sunt in propatulo, omissis."

Dr. C. has carefully read through seven manuscripts preserved in the British Museum. They are distinguished in the Var. Edit. by these letters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G.

The MS. marked E, contains only the three first books of the Odes, and "quatuor Odas libri quarti." The MS. marked G, contains the Epistle, the Art of Poetry, and "primos sermones novem." We think that Dr. Combe should have said the four *first* Odes of the fourth book, and the nine first Satires of the first book; and, upon examining the vv. Ll. of the Var. Edit. we find our opinion confirmed.

We shall present to our readers Dr. C.'s catalogue of these Harleian Manuscripts.

A	2725	Sec. 10.
B	3534	Sec. 12.
C	2724	Sec. 13.
D	3754	Sec. 15.
E	2609	Sec. 15.
F	4862	Sec. 15.
G	2621	Sec. 13.

The foregoing enumeration is, we doubt not, very accurate. But it were to be wished that Dr. C. had given in his preface a specimen of every manuscript, and enabled his readers to judge for themselves of their respective antiquity, and consequently of their authority.

The Dr. speaks with gratitude, and even triumph, of the politeness which he experienced from the

persons who attend at the Royal Library, where he had access to the Editio princeps of Horace, and he bestows many just encomiums upon a collection, which reflects the highest lustre on royal munificence. He makes also very proper acknowledgments to the Curators of the British Museum, "pro humanitate quâ codices manuscriptos omnes quibus opes fuit, ei accommodârunt."

The Dr. tells us, that his notes are chiefly taken from the writings of Bentley, Cuningham, Baxter, Gesner, Klotzius, Janus, Waddelus, Wakefield, and others, whom it was scarce necessary to particularise, "præsertim," says he, "cùm nomina singulorum quorum notis usus sum ad calcem hujusce procemii subjunxi." We shall in due time produce very strong objections to the accuracy of this statement.

The Dr. proceeds thus: Quod ad loca in notis citata spectat, hæc quidem accuratè recognita et collata, sæpenumero castigata, in vestras manus trado. This is a bold declaration indeed, and, for the present, we are content with saying, in the words of Longinus, τὸ δὲ ἦν ἄρα οὐχὶ τοσοῦτον, οὐδὲ ὀλίγου δεῖ.—Longin. Sec. 32.

Of the Index, Dr. C. thus speaks: "Indicem vocabulorum omnium copiosum, et aliis præcedentibus locupletiorem adjeci; Index enim à Thoma Tretero collectus, ter mille in locis, et ultra, auctus et emendatus est." Our readers, we doubt not, are well acquainted with the correctness of the late Mr. Homer, in the very useful office of making Indexes. We trust that Dr. C. has profited by the example

of his friend. We think the Index to the Var. Horace very copious; and, without professing to have undergone the drudgery of a minute inquiry, we have found it in many instances very exact.

In the close of the preface Dr. C. adverts to the memory of Mr. Homer; and, because our own opinions and our own feelings entirely harmonize with the Doctor's, we lay before our readers the following sentences:

"Huic procemio finem hìc imponere vellem, sed amici, qui mecum hancce operam inceperat, quique mecum familiariter, dum superstes, vixerat, præmatura mors hoc in loco non est prætereunda silentio.

"Fungamur igitur non inani munere, et merita egregii viri Henrici Homer, consiliorum omnium societate mecum nuper conjunctissimi, in memoriam revocemus. Fuit ille literarum, artiumque humaniorum scientissimus, vitâ sanctus, probitatis, fidei, et amicitiarum tenax, in prosequendis studiis pertinacissimus, et, dum vires manebant, labore et vigiliâ indomitus; nihil tamen gravitati severæ serviebat, intervalla enim negotiorum faceto lepore, ut mos est amicorum, dispungebat jucunditer.

"Viri tali ingenio, tantâ rerum cognitione, qui Doctorum studiis se adjutorem præstabat, qui bibliothecis tot ornamenta addidit, quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus? Lugeatis Eum mecum omnes, quibuscunque cordi sunt literæ, quibuscunque candor, et fides et honestas in pretio habentur, lugeatis.

"*O fallacem hominum spem, fragilemque fortunam, et inanes nostras contentiones: quæ in medio spatio sæpe franguntur, et corruunt, et ante in ipso cursu obruuntur quàm portum conspicere potuerunt.*"

The eulogy upon Mr. Homer is well founded, and well timed. The quotation from Cicero is pertinent and pathetic. But we cannot help observing, that the style in the conclusion of the preface seems rather different from that of the preceding part, and bears some resemblance to the declamations we have heard in colleges.

As to the style of the preface, it is neither decorated by splendour, nor disgraced by quaintness.

It is grave without dignity, and intelligible without elegance. It deserves some praise, and provokes little censure. But if the Latinity of Lipsius was sometimes arraigned with justice by Henry Stephens, that of Strada by Gaspar Scioppius, and that of Bentley by Richard Johnson, the authors of the British Critic may stand acquitted by Dr. C. of presumption, when they take the liberty of saying, that in the compass of three pages they have found two passages which are written ill, and two which might have been written better. The Dr. speaking of the Royal Library, says, "utpote per favorem et gratiam regii possessoris nihil abest, quod à studiosis et literatis in hâc elegantissimâ et locupletissimâ bibliothecâ desiderari possit." We assure Dr. C. that he will find no authority for this use of utpote with nihil abest in Forcellinus, in Gesner, in Turselline, (vid. pages 895 and 1097. Edit. Schwartz, Leipsic, 1719.) Noltenius, p. 1889, gives this plain and just canon: utpote "non habet verbum, nisi intercedente qui vel quum, aut certè jungitur adjectivis sine verbo."

Intervalla enim negotiorum faceto lepore, says the Doctor, ut mos est amicorum, dispungebat *jucunditer*. We find dulciter in Appuleius, in quo (says Rhunkenius, in his admirable preface) inest antiquitatis affectatio molesta eum legentibus. Again, cupienter cupit, Ennius in Phœnice. Ampliter, Plautus in Cistell. Cupienter, Accius in Philoctete. Avariter, Plaut. in Ruden. (vid. Funccius de adolescentiâ ling. Lat. p. 298. and Laurenburgii antiquarius.) In p. 2007, of Putschius Gram. Lat. auct.

antiq. Augustin lays down some judicious rules for the formation of adverbs, and in p. 2008, he thus proceeds: "sanè circa has regulas auctoritas usa est, et in paucis præsumsit, ut diceret Cicero humaniter cùm humanè dicere debuit; et Terentius, Vitam parcè ac duriter agebat." Gesner gives three instances from Cicero of humaniter for humanè. Nizolius produces four; but in the second humaniter feremus, the true reading, perhaps,* is humanitus. In Forcellinus there is a fourth instance quoted from Nonius, where humaniter is used for moderatè, comiter, facilè—"invitus literas tuas scinderem, ita sunt humaniter scriptæ." As to the passage quoted by Augustin from Terence, our readers know well that it occurs in the first scene, first act of the Andria, and they also remember in the Adelphi,

Semper parcè ac duriter
Se habere. Act i. sc. 1.

Augustin goes on: Sed tamen ipsi auctores modestiùs et cum quodam pudore contra regulam pauca præsumserunt. Jucunditer, we are confident, is not one of those few.

Dr. C. writes, "codex G. continet solummodò Epistolas," &c. If the Doctor will take the trouble of looking at the Curæ Posteriores Cellarii, p. 168, or at Scheller's Præcep. Styli Benè Latin. p. 355. or at Noltenii Lexicon L. L. Antibarbarum, p. 1205,

* Ernestus quotes humaniter in this passage, and explains it æquo animo. Ernestus adds a fifth instance from Lib. i. de Divinatione, Sect. 7. Docebo profectò quid sit humaniter vivere; and he explains it by "hilarè." V. Clav. Ciceron.

he will find that solummodò is not used by any writer of the Augustan age, and in future he may be inclined to employ tantummodò, which is equivalent in sense, and superior in purity.

When we compare the size of the preface with the extent and variety of the work itself, we are compelled to remark, that conciseness sometimes produces obscurity; and that obscurity is not always inconvenient to editors, who may know more of facts than it is convenient for them to detail, and less of criticism than it might be safe for them to disclose.

The preface is followed by the Nomina Auctorum et Operum, ex quibus Dr. C. notas desumsit.

The index is said to have been that which was prepared by T. Treter, and of which we are to inform our readers that it was printed at Antwerp, 1575, by Christopher Plantin.

Nomina auctorum et operum ex quibus notas desumsi.

Barnes—Josh. Barnesii Edit. Homeri, 2 tom. 4to. 1711.
Baxt.—Gul. Baxteri Edit. Horatii, 8vo. 1725.
Bent.—Rich. Bentleii Edit. Horatii, 4to. 1711.
Bond—Joh. Bond Edit. Horatii, 8vo. 1670.
Bowyer—Explicationes veterum aliquot auctorum ad finem, Εὐριπίδου Ἱκέτιδες, 4to. 1763.
Cruqu.—Jacobi Cruquii Edit. Horatii, 4to. 1611.
Cuning.—Alex. Cuningamii animadversiones in Rich. Bentleii Notas et Emendationes ad Horatium, 12mo. 1721.
Dac.—And. Dacier Edit. Horatii, 8 tom. 12mo. 1709.
Desp.—Lud. Desprez Edit. Horatii, in usum Delphini, 4to. 1691.
Gesn.—Jo. Matt. Gesneri Edit. Horatii, 8vo. 1772.
Hare—Jo. Hare Epistola Critica, 4to. 1726.
Hurd—R. Hurd S. T. Pr. Edit. Epistolarum Horatii ad Pisones et Augustum, 3 tom. 12mo. 1766.
Jan.—M. Christ. David Jani Edit. Carminum Horatii, 2 tom. 8vo. 1778.
Jas. de Nor.—Jason de Noris in Epistolam Q. Horatii, de arte poeticâ, 8vo. 1553.
Klotz.—Chr. Adolph. Klotzii Lectiones Venusinæ, 8vo. 1770.

Lamb.—Dion. Lambini Edit. Horatii, fol. 1577.
Lin.—Car. Linne Systema Vegetabilium, 8vo. 1784.
———— Systema Naturæ, 8vo. 1766.
Muret.—M. Ant. Mureti Edit. Horatii, 8vo. 1561.
Markl.—Jer. Markland Epistola Critica, 8vo. 1723.
Pulm.—Theod. Pulmanni Edit. Horatii, 12mo. 1564.
Rutg.—Jani Rutgersii Lectiones Venusinæ, 12mo. 1699.
Sanad.—Sanadon Edit. Horatii, 2 tom. 4to. 1728.
Taylor—Jo. Taylor de Jure Civili Angliæ, 4to. 1756.
Torr.—Lauren. Torrentii Edit. Horatii, 4to. 1608.
Waddel.—Georgii Waddeli Animadversiones in loca quædam Horatii, &c. 12mo. 1734.
Wake.—Gilberti Wakefield in Horatium Observationes Criticæ, editæ cum poematibus suis partim scriptis, partim redditis, 4to. 1776.
———— Sylva Critica. 2 tom. 8vo. 1789.
Zeun.—Jo. Car. Zeunii Edit. Horatii, Jo. Mathiæ Gesneri, 8vo. 1718.

After the catalogue, we next meet with the life of Horace ascribed to Suetonius, and accompanied by very copious notes from Janus, Gesner, and Baxter. This is succeeded by a life of Horace "in eodem codice," says the Var. Edit. "aliter descripta." But we read in Gesner, "in alio exemplari breviùs descripta." This seeming contradiction is not explained. But in the notes we read, "eadem paucis mutatis è codice antiquo J. Sicardi, legitur in Edit. Basil. 1527." Then follow three different readings from the Basil edition. Migravit is in the Basil for commigravit. De Arte Poeticâ is wanting in the Basil, and for "optime Acron," the Basil reads "optime Æmilius." In Gesner there are no various readings; but we find migravit (which is a various reading in the Basil) inserted in the text of the Variorum, and we also find in line 10. of Gesner, "scripsit," but in line 8. of the Variorum, "scripsit

autem." These variations are of little consequence, nor shall we attempt to account for them.

In the Var. Edit. we next meet with vita Horatii, "in tribus codd. Bland. aliter descripta." This life is not in Gesner, but Dr. C. found it in Janus.* There is a fourth life in the Variorum, called Q. Horatii Flacci Vita per annos digesta. Dr. C. does not explain whence he took it, but we imagine that it was from Janus.

We could wish that Dr. C. had favoured us with what Johannes Masson has written on the chronology of Horace; vid. Fabric. Bib. Lat. vol. i. p. 234. with Dacier's Chronologia Horatiana, prefixed to the Delphin edition by Desprez; and, above all, with a tract called de Temporibus Librorum Horatii et poematum adeo Ricardi Bentleii sententia. Gesner has inserted it, and Dr. C. should have attended to these words of Gesner: "Sed operæ pretium est, h. e. Studiosis Horatii, qui Bentleianum exemplar ad manus hon habent accommodatum, poni post hanc præfationem locum integrum ex præfatione viri magni, quo tempora librorum Horatii ordinat: hoc certè confirmare possum, me, dum

* Mitscherlich, whose first Vol. of Horace was published at Leipsic in 1800, has not mentioned the *Variorum Edition*. He has judiciously subjoined, as did the Variorum Editors, "Vitam poetæ a Massono ampla doctrina instructam, a Jani scite in Compendium redactam;" and he adds, "Quæ vel sola argumentorum affatim suppedidat, quam infirma omnino Bentleii temporum sit ratio qua Horatium primum, idque annis ætatis suæ 26, 33, sermonibus, postea biennio Epodis, deinde septem annis tribus prioribus Carminum libris, tum Epistolarum libro primo inde Carminum libro 4, et Seculari, denique Arti et Epistolarum libro secundo uni vacasse demonstrare conatus est."—Vide Præfat. p. 21.

recenseo singulas eclogas, diligenter attendisse, si quid esset, Bentleianis temporum rationibus adversum, nec deprehendisse quidquam, quod momentum aliquod ad eas evertendas haberet, licèt quibusdam eclogis non improbabili ratione fortè tempus etiam aliud, recentius præsertim, possit adscribi."

Bentley's Sententia, if produced, might have illustrated and confirmed the observations of the very learned Dr. Warton, in p. 7. of his Dedication to the Essay upon Pope. "Horace," says Dr. Warton, "has more than once disclaimed all right and title to the name of poet, on the score of his ethic and satiric pieces:

Neque enim concludere versum
Dixerit esse satis.

are lines often repeated, but whose meaning is not extended and weighed as it ought to be." Now Horace, according to Bentley's calculation, wrote the first book of the Satires in the 26th, 27th, and 28th years of his age; the second in the 31st, 32d and 33d; the Epodes in 34 and 35; the first book of the Odes in 36, 37, 38. From the interval, therefore, between the date of the first book of the Satires, from which Dr. Warton quotes, and the subsequent publication of the Odes, it appears, according to Bentley, Horace had not been distinguished in the character of a lyric poet, when he said:

Primum ego me illorum, dederim quibus esse poetis,
Excerpam numero.

Whence Dr. Combe took the fourth life of Horace inserted in the Variorum, why he inserted it, and why he omitted the above-mentioned work of Bentley, we are not informed.

We afterwards come to a tract De Amicis Horatii; and, as Dr. Combe is silent here too, we are abandoned to conjecture, when we ascribe that tract to Janus, in consequence of the following words, which we read in Part IV. of the Bibliotheca Critica, p. 86: "Horatii amicos recenset sic, ut omnia festinanter corrasisse videatur. Conferant harum literarum studiosi ab eo dicta de Q. Dellio cum animadversatione Ruhnkenianâ ad Vell. Pat. 2. 84. 3. ut intelligant quid sit temerè effundere, quid accuratè cogitatèque scribere." Upon the authority of of report, and from the signature of H. W. in p. 96 of the Bibliotheca Critica, we have been accustomed to ascribe the learned but severe review of Janus's Horace to Mr. Wagner.

The Variorum Edition, after the little tract, De Amicis Horatii, presents us with two Odes, which some time ago were published from a manuscript in the Vatican, and which are properly rejected in p. 28 of the Prolegomena of the Variorum, as unworthy of Horace. This sentence appears to be adopted from Janus.

After the Odes, we come to the Testimonia Antiqua de Horatio, two of which are found in Gesner, but the other three, from Ovid, Petronius, and Persius, are not in Gesner, but transferred from Janus.

We next meet with a valuable tract of Aldus Manutius, De Undeviginti Generibus Metrorum Horatii, and the Metra Horatiana, as drawn up by Christopher Wase. The former is in Janus, but the latter is inserted in Gesner.

Many readers would perhaps have commended the editor for having followed the example of Schroeder in his edition of Seneca's Tragedies; of Havercamp, in his edition of Lucretius; and of many other scholars, who have accumulated metrical information in their editions of classical authors. We hope to be pardoned for stating that the Bibl. Lat. of Fabricius points out several sources of metrical criticism not unworthy our editor's attention. "Metrorum Horationorum rationem explicârunt, ex antiquis Diomedes, 3 Art. Gram. p. 517—528; è recentioribus, Nic. Perottus et Aldus Manutius, quos jam supra memoravi, tum Franciscus Patricius qui MS. fuit in Bibl. Heinsianâ, ut Dan. Bambergium aliosque* omittam." Vid. Fabric. Bibl. Lat vol. i. p. 250.

We have now finished our detail of the preliminary matter found in the Var. Edit. It is with great concern that we notice the omission of the *præsidia*, as Gesner calls them, of his edition of Baxter. This little work is replete with information very necessary to be communicated to the readers of Gesner's Horace. It gives a clear account of the Princeps Editio, which Gesner prefers to every manuscript, and which Maittaire by conjecture assigns to Antonius Zarotus Parmensis. Scholars will be the more interested in the history and description of that edition, because, before the ap-

* Dr. Charles Burney, whose learning, taste, and penetration, are justly admired by every scholar, has drawn up a most excellent system upon the metre of Horace. The work is replete with accuracy, perspicuity, and elegance; and we hope that the author will not long withhold it from the public.

pearance of Gesner, it was the only one in which we could find the celebrated reading of pretium mentis, for per vim mentis, in v. 140. Epist. 2. Lib. 2.

To depreciate what we know not, and to overvalue what we know, are failings from which human nature is rarely exempted by the strongest powers of genius, and the most confirmed habits of reflection. He that has attained excellence is animated with fresh enthusiasm upon every fresh contemplation of the science in which he excels. With a dim and imperfect remembrance of the motives and the circumstances which accompanied the earlier stages of his enquiries, he confounds simple choice with complex comparison, and ascribes to judgment what was the result of accident. He considers the object chosen as peculiarly adapted to the extent of his own views, and the vigour of his own faculties. He is persuaded, that the same attainments which are most agreeable and most ornamental to himself, must be the most advantageous and interesting to mankind. Upon comparing self with other men, he is conscious of real superiority; and then, by an easy delusion, in which fancy is ductile to pride, he transfers the same superiority from his talents to his studies; and he looks down upon every other part of human knowledge as unworthy of his notice, or subordinate and subsidiary to those pursuits which habit has facilitated, and success endeared.

The attention of the present age has been very generally directed to experimental philosophy, to

historical investigation, and to the discussion of the profoundest subjects in politics, in morals, and in metaphysics.

—— Quod magis ad nos
Pertinet, et nescire malum est, agitamus.

As members of civilised society, and as friends to the whole commonwealth of literature and science, we acknowledge the utility of such researches; we are sensible of the difficulties attending them, and we admire all the judicious and intense exertions of the human understanding by which those difficulties are gradually surmounted. But, however extensive may be the importance of the studies which are now most prevalent, and however brilliant the success with which they have been prosecuted, we feel no diminution of our reverence for the labours of those scholars who have employed their abilities in explaining the sense, and in correcting the text of ancient writers. Verbal criticism has been seldom despised sincerely by any man who was capable of cultivating it successfully; and if the comparative dignity of any kind of learning is to be measured by the talents of those who are most distinguished for the acquisition of it, philology will hold no inconsiderable rank in the various and splendid classes of human knowledge. By a trite and frivolous sort of pleasantry, verbal critics are often holden up to ridicule as noisy triflers, as abject drudges, as arbiters of commas, as measurers of syllables, as the very lacqueys and slaves of learning, whose greatest ambition is, " to pursue the triumph, and partake the gale," which wafts writers of genius into the wished-

for haven of fame. But even in this subordinate capacity, so much derided, and so little understood, they frequently have occasion for more extent and variety of information, for more efforts of reflection and research, for more solidity of judgment, more strength of memory, and, we are not ashamed to add, more vigour of imagination, than we see displayed by many sciolists, who, in their own estimation, are original authors. Some of the very satellites of Jupiter are superior in magnitude, and perhaps in lustre, to such primary planets as Mars and the Earth.

To a correct and comprehensive view of the learned languages, a critic must add a clear conception of the style, and a quick feeling of the manner by which his author is distinguished. He must often catch a portion of the spirit with which that author is animated. And who, that has perused the various writings of Grotius, of Erasmus, of Casaubon, of Salmasius, of the two Scaligers, of Muretus, of Bentley, of Ernestus, of Hemsterhuis, will venture to deny, that they had abilities to produce works, equal, and sometimes more than equal, to those which they have explained? On some occasions, indeed, they hold a secondary rank; but they are secondary, it should be remembered, to Virgil, to Horace, to Cicero, the *Dii Majorum gentium* of literature, and by inferiority to such writers the human intellect is not degraded.

When we reflect upon the patronage with which the British Critic has already been honoured by the members of the Established Church, we are con-

vinced that no formal and elaborate apology will be required by them for the extent to which any philological disquisitions may be occasionally carried in our Review. In the days which are past indeed, but to which every scholar looks back with gratitude and triumph, the Church of England was adorned by a Gataker, a Pearson, a Casaubon,* a Vossius,† a Bentley, a Wasse, and an Ashton.‡ Within our memory it has boasted of Pearce and Burton, of Taylor and Musgrave, of Toup and Foster, of Markland and Tyrwhitt, and of Porson. At the present hour,§ we recount with honest pride the literary merits of Burney, of Huntingford, of Routh, of Cleaver, of Burgess; and when the name of Wakefield occurs to us, who does not heave a momentary sigh, and catching the spirit with which Jortin once alluded to the productions of learned and ingenious Dissenters, repeat the emphatical quotation of that most accomplished and amiable scholar, "Qui tales sunt, utinam essent nostri?" See Preface to the Remarks upon Ecclesiastical History, vol. I.

After these preliminary observations, which are evidently intended to justify both the length and the minuteness of our remarks upon the Variorum Edi-

* Isaac Casaubon had a Prebend at Canterbury, and at Westminster.

† Isaac Vossius, son of Gerrard, was Canon of Windsor.

‡ Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, of whom we quote Mr. Wakefield's words: "Venerabilis viri Caroli Ashton, D.D. viri, vel Bentleio judice, qui semper eum et laudibus et amore prosequebatur, doctissimi, et collegii Jesu, apud Cantabrigienses, per quinquaginta annos magistri." Silva Critica, part iii. page 90.

§ 1812.

tion of Horace, we shall proceed to support these strictures, which have already been laid before our readers.

Dr. Combe speaks thus of Baxter's edition, improved by Gesner: "Hujusce editionis contextum, nisi in locis quibusdam, ab incuriâ typographorum, manifestè pravis, *nihil prorsus* mutare ausus, pro exemplari adhibui."

The Doctor says, that he has made no change whatsoever, except in passages corrupt. But it seems to us, that in passages not corrupted, changes have now and then been made; nor can we always assign the reason which induced the learned editor to make them.

Lib. i. Od. iii. l. 21.—Od. xv. l. 13 and 16. Gesner reads Nequicquam, the Variorum nequidquam.*

Lib. i. Od. iv. l. 19. Gesner Lycidam, Variorum Lycidan.

The Variorum here differs from Baxter's text in opposition to the spirit of Baxter's note, in which we are told that it is of no consequence whether we admit the Latin or the Greek termination, and in which Bentley is attacked for the favour he shows to Hellenisms and Archaisms, in writing Latin words.

Lib. i. Od. xiv. l. 17. Gesner solicitum, the Variorum sollicitum.

Lib. i. Od. xviii. l. 4. Gesner solicitudines, the Variorum sollicitudines.

Lib. iii. Od. vii. l. 9. Gesner solicitæ, the Variorum sollicitæ.

---

* This variation occurs in the first volume of the Variorum, but in the second volume there are two instances where Dr. C. seems to forget the Variorum edition, and follows Gesner.

Lib. ii. Sat. 7. l. 27. and Lib. i. Epist. 3. l. 32. Nequicquam occurs both in Gesner and the Variorum.

Lib. iii. Od. xxix. l. 16. Gesner solicitam, the Variorum sollicitam.
Lib. iv. Od. i. l. 14. Gesner solicitis, the Variorum sollicitis.
Lib. iv. Od. xiii. l. 6. Gesner solicitas, the Variorum sollicitas.
Lib. i. Sat. ii. l. 3. Gesner solicitum, the Variorum sollicitum.
Lib. ii. Sat. viii. l. 68. Gesner solicitudine, the Variorum sollicitudine.
Lib. ii. Ep. i. 221. Gesner solicito, the Variorum sollicito.

In the foregoing, and perhaps some other similar instances, the Variorum differs from Gesner; and, in the following instances, either Gesner, agreeing with the Variorum, differs from himself; or the Variorum editors, agreeing with Gesner, differ from themselves.

Lib. i. Od. xxxv. l. 5. Gesner and the Variorum give sollicita: but Epod. xiii. l. 10. Gesner solicitudinibus, and the Variorum give solicitudinibus.
Lib. ii. Sat. iii. 253. Gesner and the Variorum give solicitus.
Lib. ii. Sat. ii. l. 43. Gesner and the Variorum give solicitat.*
Lib. i. Sat. vi. l. 119. Gesner and the Variorum give solicitus.
Lib. i. Ep. v. 18. Gesner and the Variorum give solicitis.

Upon comparing the accuracy of Gesner with that of our editors, in the foregoing words, we find that Gesner once differs from himself; that in nine instances our editors differ from Gesner, and that in five instances their text corresponds with Gesner's, and varies from the orthography which more frequently occurs in their own. In a work professing to follow Gesner we had a right to look for uniformity; and, in point of fact, we find differences unexplained, and to us inexplicable, except on the supposition that our editors were ignorant† of the

* This word is printed in the Index of the Variorum sollicitet.

† We have heard that Mr. H. was neither ignorant, nor indifferent; that he often consulted the orthography of Cellarius, and often applied to his friends in cases of difficulty. In all pro-

dispute about the spelling of these words, or indifferent to the opinion of critics who may prefer one mode of spelling to the other. But upon Gesner it would be presumptuous to charge such ignorance, or such indifference; for in his text only one variation is found, and as that one may with probability be imputed to the printer, we commend him for preserving that uniformity which our editors have neglected. From the uncertainty of the derivation in the word solicitus, and from the unwillingness of the antiqui librarii to double letters, we admit with Gesner that the orthography of the word is doubtful, and yet we would recommend to every editor the preservation of uniformity. Vid. Heineccii fund. Stil. Cult. p. 38. Cellarii Orthograp. p. 127. Schelleri Præcept. p. 41.

That the practice of Gesner sometimes over-ruled the doubts of our editors, we may infer from the correspondence of their text in one word to that of Gesner, where the text of Gesner is not correspondent in orthography to itself.

Lib. i. Od. vi. l. 16. Gesner and the Variorum give Tydeiden; and in Od. xv. l. 28. both give Tydides.

We shall bring forward other variations for which Dr. C. has not accounted.

---

bability the Preface, if he had lived to write it, would have been satisfactory to every candid scholar, and the profession of following Gesner would have been made with some limitations and restrictions. We beg leave to add, that Lambin, in the Preface to his Horace, 1568. and Heyne also in the Preface to the 2d edition of Virgil, seem to have considered it as part of their editorial duty, not to leave the subject of orthography wholly unnoticed.

Lib. i. Od. xxii. l. 14. Gesner esculetis, the Variorum æsculetis.

Lib. i. Od. xxxvi. l. 17. Gesner Damalim, the Variorum Damalin.

Lib. i. Od. xxxviii. l. 5. Gesner adlabores, the Variorum allabores.

Lib. ii. Od. v. l. 14. Gesner dempserit, the Variorum demserit.

Lib. ii. Od. xv. l. 4. Gesner cœlebs, the Variorum cælebs.*

Lib. iv. Od. xi. l. 34. Gesner fœmina, the Variorum femina.

Lib. iii. Od. x. l. 1. Gesner Tanaim, the Variorum Tanain.

Lib. iii. Od. xxvi. l. 10. Gesner Memphim, the Variorum Memphin.

Epod. Od. i. l. 20. Gesner adlapsus, the Variorum allapsus.

Carmen Seculare, l. 19. Gesner fœminis, the Variorum feminis.

Carmen Seculare, l. 72. Gesner adplicet, the Variorum applicet.

From the substitution of the Greek for the Latin termination in Damalin, Tanain, Memphin, and from the doubtful letters in allabores and applicet, we suspect that one of the editors had adopted some principles of orthography rather different from those which Gesner followed; and that in the Epodes and Carmen Seculare, Dr. C. acceded to the practice of his coadjutor without observing, or, it may be, without regarding, the deviation from Gesner.

We shall point out a few other words in which the texts of Gesner and our editors are at variance.

Lib. i. Od. xxviii. l. 3. Gesner littus, the Variorum litus.

Lib. ii. Od. x. l. 4. Gesner littus, the Variorum litus.

Lib. iii. Od. xvii. l. 8. Gesner littoribus, the Variorum litoribus.

Thus far the editors differ from Gesner; but in

* We desire our readers to observe, that in this word the text of the Odes once differs from Gesner, and once agrees with him. Vid. Od. 8. l. 3. and the text of the Epistles agrees with him; for in B. i. Epist. i. l. 88. Cœlibe is found both in Gesner and the Variorum.

Epod. xvi. l. 63. the surviving editor forgets the rule of his coadjutor, and, returning to Gesner, prints littora. Again, in the 38th line of the Carmen Seculare he abandons Gesner's text, which gives littus, and in his own text he prints litus.

Lib. i. Od. xxxiii. l. 11. Gesner ahenea, the Variorum aenea.
Lib. i. Od. xxxv. l. 19. Gesner ahena, the Variorum aena.
Lib. iii. Od. ix. l. 18. Gesner aheneo, the Variorum aeneo.
Lib. i. Ep. i. 60. Gesner aheneus, the Variorum aeneus.

If our editors had no rule for the orthography of this word, why did they differ from Gesner in the preceding examples, where they omit *h*? and if they *had* a rule, why do they break it to follow Gesner in one example, where *h* is inserted? for in Lib. iii. Od. iii. l. 65. we find a*h*eneus both in Gesner and the Variorum.

We are under the necessity of bringing forward other instances of inattention, or inconsistency.

Lib. i. Od. ii. l. 28. Gesner rettulit,* the Variorum retulit.
Lib. iv. Od. xv. l. 5. Gesner rettulit, the Variorum retulit.

Thus we see that in the Odes the Variorum edition differs in this word from Gesner, and, in the Epistles, we shall now see that it follows Gesner implicitly, even in the variations of his text.

Lib. i. Ep. xvii. l. 32. Gesner retuleris, do Variorum.
Lib. ii. Ep. i. l. 234. Gesner rettulit,† do Variorum.

---

* On this passage we find in the Variorum, p. 158, vol. i. the following note from Janus:

Rettulit (ut alias relligio, relliquiæ, &c.) scribere solent. Male hoc, v. Ill. Heyn. ad Virg. Æn. 5. 598. in V. L.—Jan. (in var. lect.) It should seem that one of the editors of the first volume adopted Janus's opinion, because the text is conformable to it. But the editor of the second volume appears to have
tten the words of Janus.

This word occurs in the Index of the Variorum, but we do

It is, we believe, generally agreed, that ocior is more correct than ocyor, and, perhaps, this will account for the accuracy and consistency of our editors. In the text of Gesner, the *i*, instead of the *y*, is always found, except once; see lib. ii. od. xi. l. 18. where we meet with ocyus; but the Variorum gives ocius.

In the word lacryma, and its derivatives, we observe, that the Variorum edition sometimes agrees, and sometimes disagrees, with the text of Gesner; and that neither the text of Gesner, nor that of the Variorum, agrees with itself.

Lib. i. Od. viii. l. 14. Gesner lacrimosa, do Variorum.
Lib. i. Od. xxi. l. 13. Gesner lacrimosum, do Variorum.
Lib. iii. Od. vii. l. 8. Gesner lacrimis, do Variorum.
Lib. i. Ep. xvii. l. 60. Gesner lacryma, do Variorum.
Lib. i. Ep. i. l. 67. Gesner lacrimosa, do Variorum.
Lib. ii. Od. vi. l. 23. Gesner lacryma, the Variorum lacrima.
Lib. ii. Od. xiv. l. 6. Gesner illacrymabilem, the Variorum illacrimabilem.
Lib. iv. Od. i. l. 34. Gesner lacryma, the Variorum lacrima.

We consider both methods of orthography as equally defensible; but we think that our editors, in conformity to the profession of the preface-writer, ought regularly to have followed Gesner in both.

In the orthography of the word paulo our editors are not consistent.

Lib. iii. Od. xx. l. 3. Gesner paulo, the Variorum paullo.
Lib. ii. Sat. iii. l. 265. Gesner paulo, the Variorum paulo.

In two other instances of the Satires, in four of the Epistles, and in one in the Art of Poetry, the

---

not find there the two instances from the Odes, nor retuleris from the 17th Epistle, Book 1st.

same agreement is found between the text of Gesner and the Variorum. But in the Odes, where the word occurs only once, the Variorum differs from Gesner. Our readers then will be pleased to remember, that through the greater part of the first volume the text of the Variorum was conducted by Dr. C. and Mr. Homer, jointly, and through the whole of the second volume by Dr. C. alone. Dr. C. follows Gesner's text in printing paulo; and Mr. H. in not following it, might have some reason for preferring paullo.

We shall now remark a class of words, in the orthography of which the Variorum differs, more or less, from Gesner's text, and as the difference in one of these words is uniform, we suppose that it is founded upon some principle, which, though unexplained, may be very just.

Lib. ii. Od. ix. l, 9. Gesner urgues, the Variorum urges.
Lib. iv. Od. 9. l. 27. Gesner urguentur, the Variorum urgentur.
Lib. ii. Sat. iv. l. 77. Gesner urguere, the Variorum urgere.
Lib. ii. Sat. iii. l. 30. Gesner urguet, the Variorum urget.
Lib. i. Epist. xiv. l. 26. Gesner urgues, the Variorum urges.
A. P. l. 434. Gesner urguere, the Variorum urgere.
Lib. ii. Od. xiv. l. 27. Gesner tinguet, do Variorum.
Lib iii. Od. xxiii. l. 13. Gesner tinguet, do Variorum.
Lib. iv. Od. xii. l. 23. Gesner tinguere, the Variorum tingere.

Gesner is consistent with himself in the use of both words. Our editors are consistent with themselves, and at variance with Gesner, in the orthography of urgeo. Once they differ from Gesner, and twice they agree with him, in the word tingo.

Inter virtutes grammatici habebitur aliqua nescire. So said Quintilian;* so, perhaps, would some

* Vide Rollin's Quintilian, p. 29.

of our contemporaries say of the controversies which have been agitated by scholars on the subject of orthography. But when an editor professes to follow the text of a work, which he has deliberately chosen as the best model for his own edition, we hope to give no offence by applying to him the observation which Quintilian makes upon another occasion, *Illum ne in minimis quidem oportet falli.

Of the alterations admitted into the text of the first volume, we should not always disapprove, if the preface-writer had not forbidden us to expect them. We know that some of those alterations are made in conformity to the best rules of orthography; we believe that one of the persons who sometimes made them, understood clearly, and deliberately followed, those rules. But we contend that, in point of fact, the text of the Variorum does not correspond to the text of Baxter.

The indispensable and appropriate excellence of an edition like that which we are now examining consists in accuracy; and one of the rules, according to which our preface-writer has professed to be accurate, is the text of Gesner. Now, in our former Review, we asserted, that the Variorum edition had deviated from this rule, and, on the present occasion, we have supported our assertion by more than FORTY instances of variation from the text of Gesner, where that text is not manifestly corrupted by the carelessness of printers. We are perfectly aware that a detail of this kind is not very usual in periodical publications, nor very interesting to less

* Vide Rollin's Quintilian, p. 31.

learned readers. But we appeal with confidence to the Variorum edition itself for the truth of our assertion, and to the judgment of scholars for the importance of our proofs.

We trust that the good sense and the candour of the editor will induce him to consider us as discharging the duty which we owe to the public, when we point out some errors in the breathings and accents of Greek words.

VOL. I.

P. 13. καλος wants the grave on the ult.

P. 16. εὐφορτοι wants an acute on the antepen.

—— κνοε wants an acute on the penult.; and τουτ' stands before ἐρδοίτε.

P. 26. οὐδὲ πόκ' ὕστερον for οὐδέποκ' ὕστερον.

P. 28. χρυσους wants a circumflex on the ultimate.

P. 29. ἀιετὸι is printed with a rough, instead of a smooth breathing.

P. 40. We observe, that the penult. of the word πληρες wants a circumflex.

P. 44. των wants the circumflex.

P. 48. Janus produces a note from Lambin, which contains a passage from Philostratus in his first book of Icones. Now we find the passage neither produced nor referred to in the immediate text of our Lambin, which was published, Lutetiæ, 1567; but Torrentius, in his note on the passage, says, fabulam lepidissimè referri Philostratus imaginum, Lib. i. The reader will find the story in the 26th Icon of Philostratus, and the words of Philostratus in the *omissa* of our edition, p. 331. *

P. 53. του wants the circumflex.

P. 54. ἔχουσα is thus falsely printed as to the second accent.

P. 62. των wants the circumflex.

P. 65. μιλτόπάρηοι wants the ι subscript in the penult.

P. 66. μεν wants the grave.

P. 70. κρεισσων wants the acute on the penult.

P. 72. there is no comma at οὗτος in the lines quoted from Plato.

* We write this paragraph in favour of Janus's note, which we suppose agrees with Lambin's edition of 1577.

P. 72. ἀπηρε wants a circumflex; and, perhaps, an ι subscript * in the penult.

P. 84. γλαυχωπις has no circumflex on the penult. and is spelled wrong with a χ. Ηρη wants the rough breathing, and the acute on the penult. ἐνοσιγαιος is spelled with a single ν, instead of a double. The error is indeed in Lambin, but ought to have been corrected by Dr. C.

P. 85. τέ δέ μοι. τε is put for τι. In Baxter it is τὶ.

P. 101. ορημι wants the smooth breathing, and an acute on the antepen. Lambin gives ὀρημι for the Æolic verb unaspirated.

—— ἀκοαι μοι, an acute is wanting on the final of ακοαι. In Lambin it is printed right.

P. 107. ἀμήθητον for ἀμύθητον.

P. 145. γελωντι wants the circumflex on the penult.; and if the Doctor had examined Theocritus, as well as the note of Janus, he would have avoided the mistake in the Variorum. As we are not for the present in possession of Janus's edition, we know not whether this and other errors were committed by him.

P. 183. ορκος wants the aspirate and acute.

P. 199. ἀμοιβεσθαι has no acute on the antepen.: perhaps it was absorbed in the β.

P. 210. χθονὸς should have an acute, not a grave on the ult., for it is the end of a sentence.

P. 227. οὐδ ἴιλέ πω με. As πω throws the accent on the final of ἴιλε, we think that με should be accented with a grave. See p. 76 of the Treatise on Greek Accents, by Messrs. Port Poyal, published in London, 1729. But this error, if it be one, is slight; and our editors followed Dr. Bentley.

P. 242. των is not accented.

P. 250. γνώμη μὴ καθαρένοι. Here, in the Variorum, γνώμη wants the ι subscript. If Janus quotes καθαρενοι, he is wrong; and if Dr. C. had consulted Bergler's edition of Aristophanes,

---

* Caninius maintains, that ἦρα and ἦρκα, of ἀίρω, should not have the ι subscript; because, say Messrs. Port Royal in their Gr. Grammar, ἀρῶ, the future has no ι subscript. See Port Royal's Gr. Grammar, p. 105. We find ἦρκα without the ι subscript, p. 155, of Caninius. But to those who have read Lennep de Analogia, Gr. L. any arguments drawn from the modern method of deriving tenses from each other will not be quite satisfactory. The opinion of Caninius probably was not present to the mind of our editors when they printed απηρε without the ι, and the general practice of editors is to print with it.

† In our edition somebody has written in the margin αμηθητον.

instead of Kuster's, he would have found, and, we trust, would also have adopted, the better reading καθαρεύει.

P. 251. κυανέοισιν ἐπ' ὄφρυσι. This is a great error. It is committed, we grant, in Gesner's note; and there, doubtless, the blame is to be laid on the printers. We should have been glad to find κυανέῃσιν in the Variorum edition, which is the true and obvious reading.

Ibidem. κυανέῃσι wants the ι subscript.

P. 264. ἔθει is erroneously put for ἤθει, but in Gesner it is right.

P. 381. ἠλακάιτη for ἠλακάτη.

P. 503. χὰι printed with a χ instead of a κ.

Ibidem. ῥεόν instead of ῥέον. The same mistake is in Klotzius, from whom the note is taken.

Ibidem. διαν τε for δια τε. This error is also in Klotzius; but the text of Musæus is right.

Ibidem. λευκοπάρηος wants the ι subscript.

P. 505. πτερὶγύων for πτερύγων. This very gross mistake occurs in the Venusinæ Lectiones of Klotzius, p. 383.*

P. 508. ὅτιον should be separated.

Ibidem. τίς ποτ' ἐστιν. We are confident that ἐστιν should have an accent upon the final syllable; and we refer Dr. Combe to the Treatise upon Accents above mentioned. Upon examining Lambin, we find the accent faintly marked; and, upon looking into Johnson's Sophocles, we find it distinctly marked.

P. 541. ἱμερόεντες put erroneously for ἱμερόεντες.

P. 569. Φρυγιον is without an accent.

P. 580. Neglenter in the notes for Negligenter.

P. 615. ἀμετερῆσι twice wants the ι subscript; but in Lambin from whom the note is taken, the word is right in both places. In the second note, Lambin refers to Lucian in his Dialogi Meretricii, where the dialogue begins Ἐι τίν' ἴσθα. Our editor has made the reference more clear by referring to the fourth dialogue in the third volume; but, he might have added, of Reitzius's edition.

P. 616. ἴνὶ has a circumflex accent instead of a smooth breathing on the first syllable, and μηγαροις should be μεγαροις.

P. 617. τησιν is once without the circumflex on the penult.

---

* While we lament the frequent mistakes which occur in Greek words, we see great commendation due to the editor for the care with which Latin words have nearly in all instances been printed; we heard with much satisfaction that on the discovery of a few mistakes after the publication of the work, the editor cancelled p. 124 of the 1st volume, and pp. 265 and 481 of the 2d volume.

P. 630. οὐδέν is erroneously put for οὐδέν.

P. 634. ἄπο is erroneously printed for ἀπὸ.

Ibidem. ποτνίαι erroneously printed for πότνιαι. The error is in Bentley's note; but a slight glance upon the text of Aristophanes would would have enabled Dr. C. to correct it.

VOL. II.

P. 9. ημέραν wants the rough breathing, though we find it rightly placed in Baxter.

P. 20. λοιδό ρημα is improperly separated.

P. 34. την δἀρα Γαλλος εχοι. These four words are without accents, and the apostrophic mark is wanted at δ before ἄρα.

P. 37. ὕμνων has a grave accent instead of an acute on the penultimate, and of this strange error we shall find more instances in the second volume of the Variorum Edit.

P. 38. ὑπάτῃ has a grave instead of a rough breathing upon the antepenult.; but in Gesner, from whom the note is taken, the word is printed right.

P. 85. αππα has no accent nor breathing, but is right in Baxter.

P. 115. συν', before δαίμονι, should have a grave accent instead of the apostrophic mark.

P. 117. ποτἐονται has the mark of a smooth breathing instead of an acute on the antepenult. In Gesner the word is printed right.

P. 169. Upon line 85. Sat. ii. lib. ii. Dr Combe produces, from Lambin, a note which we cannot find in our edition, printed by T. Maccæus, 1567. The Doctor, in his catalogue of authors, speaks of Lambin's edition, published 1577; we have not that edition; but we find it mentioned in the Bibliotheca Latina of Fabricius, who says, that it was published at Franckfort, 1577; and Harles, in his Introductio in notitiam Literaturæ Romanæ, says of the second and improved edition of Lambin, "Francof. typis Wechelianis aliquoties repetita in forma maxima et quarta." The folio, says Fabricius, was printed at Franckfort, 1577, and the quarto in 1596. We therefore suppose the folio to contain the passage which is not found in our Paris edition. Dr. C. quotes Lambin's note thus: πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον πόιην,* which to us is unintelligible. If Dr. C. had turned from Lambin to Plutarch, he would have written πῶς δεῖ τὸν νέον ποιημάτων ἀκούειν, and he would have found the passage which Lambin quotes in p. 33 of Xylander's edition. The text there gives δαπάναις

* We are told that ποιην occurs in the edition of Lambin, printed by Bartholo. Maccæus, Paris, 1605.

ἰσῶσαι, but among the vv. LL. the Basil Codex gives δαπάναισι σῶσαι, and this reading Lambin follows.

P. 169. μέσων, with a circumflex on the final, most improperly following the acute on the penult.

P. 175. νῦν κὰι Μενιππον. Dr. C. prints Μενιππον without an accent, * and he also substitutes κὰι for δὲ. This monstrous blunder is in Baxter's note, which the Doctor *transcribed*, instead of correcting, and which he would have corrected, surely, if he had consulted Lucian, to whom the epigram is ascribed. Every school-boy reads that epigram in Farnaby's collection, and every editor must acknowledge that δὲ is the true reading. We do not suppose that Dr. C. holds the heretical opinion of those critics, who maintain that οι and αι final may be made short before a word beginning with a consonant, and whom Bentley has entirely confuted in his notes upon the first hymn of Callimachus. The sense, too, no less than the metre, requires δὲ.

Ibidem. οὐδένὸς. Dr. C. gives this word two accents, though Gesner † prints only one, and Gesner is right.

P. 179. μεταλαμβανομένου τοῦ πάθους. What title has this, or any other word, to two accents, where an enclitic does not follow? or, how can a grave be placed on the *sixth* syllable from the ultimate of any word? We fear that Dr. C. has been a little misguided by Gesner, in whose edition μετα and λαμβανομενου are printed in two lines, and joined by an hyphen.

P. 186. ἐιρῶ νικως. Dr. C. makes two words of one, and he puts a circumflex upon the final of εἰρω, but leaves νικως unaccented. Gesner is not to be blamed here, for he prints εἰρωνικῶς.

P. 209. ἀκουσαις is left without an accent.

P. 210. φερὸμενος has a grave, instead of an acute, upon the antepen.

P. 225. ὑποδεχτικά. This word is printed with three mistakes: on the first syllable there is a grave accent for a rough breathing; in the third there is a χ for a κ; and on the fifth there is a smooth breathing instead of a grave accent; yet Dr. Bentley, from whom the note is taken, prints the word right; and in Suidas, whom Dr. Bentley quotes, it is equally right.

P. 251. ὥριγῆ. Baxter gives an accent to the final syllable, and upon the initial he places a rough breathing, where Dr. C.

---

* Qr. why are the ends of both Hexameters separated from the rest of the lines?

† In speaking of Baxter's edition, republished by Gesner, we indifferently use their names. We observe by the way, that the very learned Dr. Edwards convicts Dr. K. of lavishing an accent on the antepenult. of φιλοψένδη.

gives a smooth; and he puts no accent on the first syllable, where Dr. C. has added a second circumflex.

P. 265. ἐαν has no accent, and κυκλοτιρῆς is printed with a circumflex instead of a grave. The error is not in Bentley.

P. 270. μεν κηδομενον and κυντερον are without accents; ἐμε has a rough, instead of a smooth breathing; ἀλλο has a grave, instead of an acute.

P. 271. τεθαλαττωμενοι wants the acute on the penult; εἰσι wants a grave on the ult.; and λὐουσιν is marked with a rough breathing instead of an acute accent.

P. 273. μηλα wants the circumflex on the first syllable.

P. 283. ὕι καὶ ποθεῦντες. Here we have another instance of και for δε, to the violation both of the metre and the Greek.

P. 286. καϑ' ἡ λιβὰτων. Here we have two words instead of one, ἡλιβάτων; and a grave upon the penult., instead of an acute; yet the word in Gesner is printed right, as one word.

Ibidem. φεὐγοντα with a smooth breathing, instead of an acute accent on the antepenult.

P. 303. χρᾶθαι for χρῆσθαι; but the mistake is in Baxter also.

P. 307. Καλλιμαχος has no accent; and τὴν is put for τὴν.

P. 319. κρὺπτεδε. We are not happy enough to be acquainted with this word. Sophocles wrote κρύπτεται with an acute, not a grave, on the antepenult.; and, as Sophocles wrote, so has Torrentius printed.

Ibidem. ἐκ γῆ. Surely γῆ should be γῆς.

P. 320. ὦ τλήμων ἀρετὴ. Here Dr. C. follows the typographical blunder in Baxter. But an ear accustomed to the sound of an Iambic verse would have been alarmed at τλημων, and Dr. C. if he had looked into Dio Cassius, would have found τλῆμον, which suits both the metre and the construction.

P. 325. The accent on δε before τέρπνον is omitted, and μοι, an enclitic after ὅτε is very improperly accented. In both these instances Dr. C. was misled by Baxter's note, where we find the same errors.

P. 330. ην has neither its accent nor its smooth breathing.

P. 335. γρηταρια for γρυτάρια. Our Lambin, from whom the note is taken, prints the word right, and the word occurs in the very next note of the Varior. where it is printed right from Baxter.

P. 337. γεννησας παγηρ. The first word should be accented on the penult.; and παγηρ should be πατηρ, with an acute on the ult.

Ibidem. το μεν δικαιον are left without their respective accents.

P. 338. We find χάιρείν and ˜πράττείν. Dr. C. to χαιρειν gives two accents instead of one; and to πραττειν, though a dissyllable, he gives a circumflex and two acutes, though other

editors would have been contented with accenting the penult. only. In this page γνωθι is without an accent.

Ibidem. ὑπέρ has an acute, instead of a grave, on the ult.

P. 339. ἠπείλησα has a rough instead of a smooth breathing, and δικαιους has no accent at all.

Ibidem. ἐὰν γὰρ συγκοινθῇ ἡ βρεχσθῇ. These words are quoted from a note in Lambin, which is not in the edition we have: but did Dr. C. find συγκοινθῇ in his Lambin; or, finding it, did he hesitate, and consult Theophrastus? We maintain that no such word exists. Upon reading συγκοινθη in the Variorum, we conjectured συγκαυθῇ, and, upon examiniug the 22d chap. of the 1st book of Theophrastus, we found our conjecture confirmed.

P. 363. ναταρρημνοι is printed for κατακρῆμνοι, και before ῥάχεις has no accent, and ἔρημοι is printed with two blunders; for ἔρημοι, and εὐτελισμὸς, has a circumflex on the first, instead of a smooth breathing.

P. 375. ποιητικοτερον for ποιητικωτερον. It has no accent on the antepen., and substitutes ο for ω.

P. 376. ἤθος wants the smooth breathing.

P. 383. τι before μὴ wants an acute; and in the same note, ἐργάση has a rough, instead of a smooth.

P. 384. ει κεν. ει here wants an acute and a smooth breathing; and ἠβώοντα should have a rough breathing, instead of a smooth.

Ibidem. οταν has neither accent nor rough breathing.

P. 386. ἀδνρῶν. This strange word is printed for ἀνδρῶν, and destroys the sense which is preserved in Lambin, though utterly abandoned in the Variorum. In the very same note the metre and the sense are destroyed in the following line, Εμὴ πίσιμος τὺχη γένοιτό μοι; μη has here a rough breathing on the final syllable, instead of the apostrophic mark, which ought to have been prefixed to 'πισιμος; επισιμος is printed for ἐπίσημος; a rough breathing is given to τυχη, instead of an acute accent; ει wants the smooth breathing, and the feminine article, which is necessary to the sense and metre, is wholly omitted.

P. 390. Ποιων wants a circumflex on the ult.

P. 397. In this page we have discovered several mistakes, which it is our duty to state as we have done elsewhere. εὐτυχήματα has an acute accent upon the initial syllable, instead of the smooth breathing; ἀλλ' before ἵνα has a grave accent, instead of a smooth breathing; and λἀβωσιν has a smooth breathing, instead of an acute, upon the first syllable.

P. 404. ἡμῖν has a smooth, instead of a rough breathing.

P. 409. Dr. C. who, we know, is a very excellent botanist, and who with uncommon solicitude has spread the Linnæan phraseology over the Variorum edition, does not seem pecu-

liarly fortunate in his quotations from Greek writers upon botanical subjects. We shall present our readers with a wonderful passage quoted by Lambin from Dioscorides, and thus printed in p. 409 of the Variorum: τρέπει δὲ καὶ χραδτὰβπι τὸ ὠχρότερον πίνομενον τε, καὶ συγχριὸμενον. After a copious dose of cummin we could not have turned more pale, than we were at the sight of this ugly and strange word χραδτὰβπι, and we defy the united sagacity of Rhunkenius and Porson to solve the difficulty by mere conjecture. In Lambin all is right, τρέπει δὲ καὶ χρῶται ἐπὶ τὸ ὠχρότερον πινόμενόν τε, καὶ συγχρίομενον. Our readers will observe, that in the Variorum συγχριὸμενον has a smooth breathing, instead of an acute accent upon the antepenult.

P. 411. καρφεται has no accent.

P. 420. Ζωσιπᾶσιν is printed as one word, instead of Ζῶσι πᾶσιν; τεθνεωτας and ἐχθρων are without accents.

P. 452. τωv has no accent.

P. 459. και and απανευθε are without accents, and Βορέῃ and Ζεφύρῳ are without the ι subscript. But the line in Lambin is printed correctly.

P. 465. κὰρπιμον has a grave upon the first, instead of an acute.

P. 466. We have ἐξηγησις with a wrong breathing, and no accent. της in the same page is without the circumflex.

P. 467. ἑκας once is without the grave on the final.

P. 473. καλως wants the circumflex on the ult.

P. 482. ιαμβιζειν has no mark of the smooth breathing on the first syllable, nor an acute on the penult. This page we hear was cancelled.

P. 491. ὁρος has a grave, instead of an acute, upon the first syllable.

P. 510. αὐτοι has a wrong breathing and no accent: ποίηταὶ has an acute upon the first, and a grave upon the last, but ought to have the grave only; τον before Θεσπιν is without an accent; ἄρσιν in the same page has a grave on the first syllable, instead of an acute.

P. 513. καθέρομαι is printed for καθαίρομαι, τῆς has a grave instead of a circumflex, and η has neither accent nor breathing.

P. 531. ἑαυτὸν has an acute accent, instead of a rough breathing, on the first syllable.

Here we close our toil in pointing out some of the errors which occur in the Greek typography of this edition, and we fear that the patience of our readers will be equally exercised and equally exhausted with our own.

May not the Greek language be understood without a knowledge of accents? Yes. May not an editor understand accents, and yet decline the use of them?* Yes. May he not understand and employ them, and yet sometimes err? Yes. But such errors, when frequent and gross, ought not to be overlooked in an edition which professes, like the present, to correct the mistakes of Baxter, Gesner, and all preceding editors, by comparing their quotations with the text of original authors. A sense of the duty which we owe to the public, extorts from us these remarks: we do not mean to offer any wanton insult to the feelings of the editor: we give him credit for real and great proficiency in various branches of useful and even ornamental knowledge; but we cannot dissemble our opinion upon the claims which he in his Preface has laid to correctness. If those claims had not been made so deliberately, and so positively; if writers were not accustomed to hold in contempt the *general* observations of critics; if readers were not prone to admit the general assertions of writers; we should not have submitted to the drudgery of examining, or the mortification of producing, particulars, so minute indeed in appearance, but, in a question about the merits of an editor, so very pertinent and decisive. Horace abounds with imitations of Greek writers, and allusions to them. The commentators upon

* Mr. Wakefield omits accents; but, in the Variorum, we have seldom or never Greek works quoted from Mr. Wakefield's observations.

Horace have, with great industry and great judgment, collected a multitude of these imitations and allusions. Every editor of Horace ought to understand them clearly, and to print them correctly. The editor of the Variorum appears to have been sensible of this duty, and he professes to have discharged it with diligence and fidelity.

We formerly expressed our doubts, not so much upon the reality, as the success, of his researches, and we have now brought forward a long and apposite series of proofs, in order to convince our readers, and to justify ourselves.

We now proceed to support our assertion, that the notes produced in the Variorum Edition of Horace do not correspond to the Catalogue of Authors, with which Dr. Combe has favoured his readers. We there find,

"Bowyer—Explicationes veterum aliquot auctorum, ad finem Εὐριπίδου ἱκετίδες, 4to. 1763."

"Markl.—Jer. Markland, Epistola Critica, 8vo. 1723."

We discharge the duty we owe to our readers, when we assure them that Bowyer never wrote any such work as the Explicationes veterum aliquot Auctorum; and that out of the Epistola Critica, which Markland did write, not one observation nor emendation is immediately selected, from the first page of the first volume to the last page of the last volume of the Variorum edition. Dr. Combe must have seen the Explicationes veterum aliquot Auctorum, yet through the Epodes, and the whole of the second volume, he has ascribed to Bowyer what Bowyer never wrote, nor was supposed to have

written; what Markland did write, and is *known* by every scholar to have written: and this error is the more strange, because the very book which was used in the Variorum edition was lent in the name of Markland; and because the very observations selected from that book in the first, second, third, and fourth book of the Odes, are properly and uniformly ascribed to Mr. Markland.

To an editor who professes to have consulted every passage quoted from every writer by every commentator, great attention is due. We pay it cheerfully; and yet we must state the difficulties which have occurred to us, and, doubtless, to some of our readers.

Epod. ii. v. 27. Fontesque lymphis obstrepunt manantibus.

The Variorum produces a note upon this line, to which the name of Bowyer is subjoined: but in p. 253 of the quarto work, which Markland published in London 1763, the very same conjectural reading of frondes for fontes is made by Markland in the very words which Dr. C. ascribes to Bowyer.

Odes. Lib. i. Carm. 35. v. 5.

Te pauper ambit sollicita prece
Ruris colonus.

Markland says, Colonus ruris est quasi diceret nauta maris. He puts a stop at prece, and another at ruris; and he says that dominam must be understood before ruris, as well as æquoris. All this matter occurs in the 254th page of Markland. It is found in p. 135, vol. i. of the variorum edition; and *there* we read, as we *ought* to read, the name of Markland. We shall now point out an omission in the Epodes; and probably such an omission as

the deceased editor would have avoided, for reasons which we know to be solid.

A. P. v. 439 and 440. —— Melius te posse negares,
Bis terque expertum frustra.

Markland, in the very page where he corrects the punctuation of Ode xxxv. Book 1. proposes a semicolon at expertum, and a colon at frustra. Dr. C. passes over this in silence; and his silence is the more remarkable, because on the 5th line of the A. P. he quotes from the very same page of Markland a new punctuation, and erroneously assigns it to Bowyer.

Epist. vii. Lib. i. l. 80. —— mutua septem
Promittit, persuadet uti mercetur agellum.
Mercatur: ne te longis, &c.

Markland, in p. 255, would read mercatus; and Dr. C. again puts Bowyer's name to Markland's words.

Epist. vii. Lib. i. l. 92. Pol, me miserum, patrone, vocares, &c.

Markland, in p. 255, says that Horace, in the 93d line of this epistle, alluded to v. 499 of Iphigen. in Tauris; and here again the Variorum edition, vol. ii. p. 337, confounds Markland with Bowyer.

Epist. i. Lib. i. l. 55.
—— hæc recinunt juvenes dictata senesque,
Lævo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto.

Markland, in p. 255, puts et after senesque, and in p. 287 of the Variorum we meet Bowyer. We must here remark a second omission; for in the very paragraph, part of which the Variorum edition quotes upon the 55th line of the first epistle, Markland proposes a similar addition of et, in the 100th line of Sat. ii. Lib. 2.

Ego vectigalia magna et
Divitias habeo,
Instead of e. v. m. Divitiasque habeo.

We ascribe this omission not to choice, but to inadvertence, unless some reason be assigned for admitting it in one of the above-mentioned places, and rejecting *et* in the other.

Odes. B. iii. Carm. 3. v. 54. —— visere gestiens.

Markland conjectures, in p. 256, vincere for visere; and in p. 276, vol. i. of the Variorum, we have Markland's conjecture and Markland's name. He reads also, debacch*a*ntur for debacch*e*ntur.

A. P. v. 431. Ut qui conducti, &c.

Markland, in p. 256, would read quæ for qui; and in p. 527, of the Var. vol. ii. Bowyer appears vice Markland.

Odes. Lib. iii. Carm. 2. v. 14. —— Mors et fugacem, &c.

Markland, in p. 257, would read efficacem, and for this he is rightly quoted in p. 260 of the 1st vol. of the Var.

We now produce a third, perhaps justifiable, omission; for in A. P. 244th line, Markland, in p. 257, instead of Sylvis deducti, proposes educti, i. e. educati. But this conjecture is left unnoticed in the Variorum edition, and was unmarked in the book sent to Mr. H.

Sat. i. Lib. i. v. 19. —— Atqui licet esse beatis.
Quid causæ est, &c.

Markland, in p. 258, would read "at queis" (pro quibus) and would substitute a comma for the full stop at beatis. But in p. 3, vol. ii. of the Variorum, we again meet with Mr. Bowyer.

Odes. Lib. iii. Carm. 29. v. 5. —— Eripe te moræ;
Nec semper udum ——

Markland, in p. 258, produces a noble emendation of this passage, made by his learned friend Nicholas Hardinge, and the same reading is also mentioned by Dr. Taylor, in his elements of Civil Law, p. 37, ut semper-udum Tibur. In the notes on the Odes of the Variorum are produced Taylor's words, and Hardinge's emendation, to which, however, is improperly affixed the name of Markland only, though Markland expressly acknowledges Hardinge to be the author.

Epodes iii. v. 20. Jocose Mæcenas, precor
Manum puella suavio opponat tuo.

Markland, p. 258, reads jocosa for jocose, and joins it with puella, and Dr. C. brings forward Bowyer.

Epod. xvi. v. 51. Nec vespertinus circumgemit ursus ovile.

Markland, p. 258, would substitute vespertinum for vespertinus; and in p. 611, vol. i. of the Variorum, the editor falls into the same error as before.

Odes. Lib. iv. Carm. 10. v. 2.
Insperata tuæ cum veniet pluma superbiæ.

Markland reads pœna, and to Markland the reading is assigned in p. 490, vol. i. of the Variorum.

Epist. 12. Lib. i. l. 22. —— et si quid petet, ultro
Defer:

Markland, p. 260, would transfer the comma from petet to ultro, which he separates from defer, and joins with petet. But in p. 356, vol. ii. of the Variorum, Bowyer is represented as the author of this punctuation.

We now state a fourth instance of omission: for in

Epist. xiv. Lib. i. v. 19. Nam quæ deserta et inhospita tesqua.

Markland, in p. 260, would read tu for nam, and

of this conjecture, though marked, no mention is made in the Variorum.

Epist. 10. Lib. i. v. 14. Novistine locum potiorem rure beato?

Markland, p. 260, reads Sabino for beato; and in p. 345, vol. ii. of the Variorum, Bowyer is produced.

A. P. v. 65. Sterilisque diu palus, aptaque remis.

Markland, p. 263, conjectures sterilisve palus pulsataque remis; and in p. 481, vol. ii. of the Variorum, the name of Bowyer recurs.

Sat. ii. Lib. i. v. 130.

Miseram se conscia clamet;
Cruribus hæc metuat, doti deprensa; egomet mî;
Discincta tunica fugiendum est, ac pede nudo,
Ne nummi pereant, aut pyga, aut denique fama.

Markland, p. 263, would substitute commas for semicolons after deprensa and mi. He throws out the line discincta tunica, &c. and in the close of the next line he would transpose pyga and fama; for all which changes the Variorum, p. 35, vol. ii. gives the name of Bowyer.

We have laid before our readers four (we do not say improper) instances of omission in the Variorum, twelve instances of error in the Epodes, Satires, and Epistles, where Bowyer is put for Markland, four instances of right quotation from Markland in the Odes, and one instance in which Markland's name is by mere oversight subjoined to an emendation which M. himself ascribes to N. Hardinge. We formerly stated that Mr. H., to the best of our recollection, lived till part of the fourth book of the Odes was advanced in the press. After his death, Dr. C. may, in many respects, be considered as the sole editor, and by him the name of

Bowyer is first introduced into the Epodes, and continued to the close of the second volume. But why then did he overlook the name of Markland, when it so often occurs in the Odes, and when it there relates to the very book which contains the very emendations produced by Dr. C. himself in the works of Horace which follow the Odes? Neither the title-page of the quarto volume, which Dr. C. ascribes to Bowyer, contains the name of Markland, nor the dedication which follows the title-page, nor Dr. Heberden's Address to the Reader which follows the dedication, nor the Explicationes veterum aliquot Auctorum, which follow the tract upon the third Latin declension. But every learned reader must know that Markland was the author. The joint editor of the Odes had again and again produced the name of Markland,* and surely when Dr. Combe perused the first volume of the Variorum, to the dedication of which his own name is subjoined, he must again and again have met with Markland's notes and Markland's name. Did he then suspect any error in his coadjutor? We believe not. Has he given any reason why the Odes speak of Markland, and the Epodes, Satires, and Epistles of Bowyer? No. How then can he account for the inconsistency between Mr. Homer and Dr. C.? We know that Mr. Homer considered Markland as the author of these emendations. We imagine that Dr. C., by some means or other, was

* He only produces the name, without referring explicitly to the observations.

not well informed about the author; and we further imagine, that he might ascribe the Explicationes veterum aliquot Auctorum to Mr. Bowyer because he found the names of Mr. Bowyer at the bottom of the title-page to Markland's work. We certainly wish the mistake about the name had not been committed at all; and if committed earlier, it might have deprived Markland of all praise; though, by the insertion of the matter, the instruction of readers is provided for. It is scarcely necessary for us to state that Mr. Markland's conjectures, &c. are contained in a work subjoined to his edition of the Supplices, and dedicated to his friend William Hall. Of the grammatical treatises de imparisyllab. declin. Gr. et Lat. forty copies were printed in 1761, and in 1763 the whole was reprinted and annexed to the Supplices Mulieres. As we have never seen the first book of 1761, we are left to infer, from a passage at the beginning of the Explicationes, that they were not originally published with the above-mentioned treatises, "ut argumentum præcedens, inamœnum per se, lætiore aliquâ materiâ distinguatur, admittente simul vel poscente talem additionem libelli mole, visum est explicanda sumere et adjicere pauca veterum auctorum loca."—Markland, p. 244.

We shall now see how far the Var. Editor has availed himself of Markland's Epistola Critica, which he mentions in the catalogue, and which we suppose him to have seen, because he is correct in saying that it was printed in 1763. We shall follow the order in which Mr. Markland has written his emendations on Horace. We shall produce all

of them for the purpose of proving that the editor has produced none; and, as the Letter to Bishop Hare is referred to in the catalogue, we, in quoting from it, shall consider ourselves as furnishing supplemental matter to the Variorum edition.

Sat. i. Lib. i. v. 29. Perfidus hic caupo.

For which Markland, p. 7, reads, Causidicus vafer hic.

Sat. i. Lib. ii. v. 63.

Primus in hunc operis componere carmina morem.

M. p. 11, reads hanc formam for hunc morem.

Sat. iii. L. xi. v. 154. Ingens accedit stomacho fultura ruenti.

M. reads in p. 69. Ingesta for ingens.

Ibid. v. 182. In cicere atque faba bona tu perdasque lupinis,
Latus ut in circo spatiere, et aeneus ut stes.

(We follow Bentley's reading et aeneus for aut æneus.)

M. p. 81, reads *largus* for latus.

Ep. i. l. 2. 207. *Lana* Tarentino violas imitata veneno.

M. p. 91, reads *læna* for lana.

In p. 91, M. resumes the passage in which he had before proposed largus for latus.

V. 184. Sat. iii. Lib. ii.

Nudus agris, nudus nummis, insane, paternis?
Scilicet ut plausus, quos fert Agrippa, feras tu.

Mutatione distinctionis, says M. in p. 92, et additione literæ unius, et sensum Horatio, et partem suam Tiberio restituisse me confido:

In cicere atque faba bona tu (Aule) perdasque lupinis,
Largus ut in circo spatiere, et aeneus ut stes
Nudus agris, nudus nummis, insane, paternis,
Scilicet? *aut* plausus quos fert Agrippa, feras tu,
(i. e. Tiberii)

Whatever may be the merit of Mr. Markland's conjectures on the foregoing passage, the Var. edit. silet.

Sat. vi. B. ii. v. 30. —— tu pulses omne quod obstat,
Ad Mæcenatem memori si mente recurras.

Markland, in p. 93, would take away the comma at obstat, and place a mark of interrogation at recurras.

Epist. ii. Lib. i. v. 25.
Sub domina meretrice fuisset turpis et excors.

M. p. 100, proposes for excors, exsors.

Od. vi. Lib. i. Scriberis Vario fortis, et hostium
Victor, Mæonii carminis aliti.

M. p. 107, proposes alteri for aliti.

Sat. 10. Lib. i. v. 68. —— librisque
Ambustum propriis.

M. p. 111, reads combustum.

Epist. vi. Lib. i. v. Improvisa simul species exterret utrumque.

M. p. 115, for exterret reads exercet.

Epist. vii. Lib. i. v. 40. —— proles patientis Ulyssei.

M. p. 134, reads sapientis for patientis.

Epist. xvii. Lib. i. v. 62.
Quære peregrinum, vicinia *rauca* reclamat.

M. p. 138, reads *cauta.*

Epist. ii. Lib. ii. v. 28.
—— post hoc vehemens lupus, et sibi et hosti
Iratus pariter.

M. p. 166, reads,

—— post hoc (vehemens lupus ut) sibi et hosti
Iratus.

Epist. i. Lib. i. v. 85. —— Cui si vitiosa libido
Fecerit auspicium.

M. p. 169, would substitute ventosa for vitiosa.

We will now balance accounts between the Epistola Critica and the Variorum catalogue. Markland's Epistola Critica contains fifteen conjectural emendations. The catalogue of the Variorum refers to the Epistola Critica, and in the notes of the Variorum, we find of these fifteen emendations—not one. Though Dr. C. may have seen the Critica

Epistola, he does not appear to have used it, and therefore we may be forgiven for expressing our wish that he had not mentioned it in the catalogue of books from which the notes of the Variorum are taken. We imagine that in the course of the work Mr. H. intended, or was advised, to consult the Epistola Critica, that it was procured by him or for him, and perhaps put down in some list, and that the successor, forgetting to inspect the Epistola Critica, and finding in the notes of the Variorum edition that Markland's name had been several times quoted, inferred that the passages under which his name appeared, were taken from the Epistola Critica, and we have already stated that the word observationes is not joined with the word Markland, even where they are cited in the Odes.

Of Bp. Hare we find the following account in the catalogue:

Hare—Jo. Hare Epistola Critica, 4to. 1726.

Bp. Hare is quoted three times in the first volume of the Variorum, and in the second he is not quoted once.

Od. i. Lib. i. v. 35. Quod si me Lyricis vatibus inseres.

The editor's note tells us, that Hare proposed to read *te* for *me*, and very properly refers us to the 263d page of Bishop Hare's work called the "*Scripture Vindicated.*"

Ibid. v. 5. —— palmaque nobilis
Terrarum dominos evehit ad deos.

Here again the joint editor of the Odes, with becoming accuracy and perspicuity, informs his readers that Bishop Hare accedes to the opinion of those learned men who would remove the point from deos

in the sixth verse to nobilis in the fifth; and for this he properly refers to the 264th page of Scripture Vindicated.

Od. xxvii. Lib. iii. v. 39.

An vitiis carentem
Ludit imago
Vana, quæ portâ fugiens eburnâ
Somnium ducit.

The Editor of the Odes, p. 405, quotes in Hare's words an emendation which a friend of Hare's suggested to him, and which Hare improved. The friend proposed quam for quæ, and Hare would add è before porta. Upon this occasion, the editor very justly refers to the Epistola Critica of Hare, but without mentioning the page. (It is the 423d, in the 2d vol. of Hare's works.) Let us compare the different treatment which Markland and Hare have experienced. Markland's Epistola Critica is referred to in the catalogue, but never quoted in the Variorum edition. Hare's Scripture Vindicated is twice quoted in the edition, but never mentioned in the catalogue. As to the Epistola Critica of Hare, it is used and quoted once by the editor of the Odes, and in all probability, if he had lived, it would have been used and quoted again. We, however, shall supply the emendation which the sole editor of the Satires has omitted.

Sat. iii. Lib. ii. v. 316. —— illa rogare,
Quantane? num tantum, sufflans se, magna fuisset?

Dr. Hare, after rejecting the opinions of Bentley and Cuningham, would read

—— Illa rogare
Quantane? num tantum sufflans se, magna fuit? tum
Major dimidio, num tantum?

Vide 328 p. vol. ii. Hare's Works.

Our learned readers will thank us for digressing a little from Dr. C. and stating the words of Waddelus, who accuses Bishop Hare of plagiarism. "Sic," says Waddelus, "distinguendus est locus."

Illa rogare
Quantane? num tantum, sufflans se, magna fuisset?
Major dimidio, num tantum.

In quibusdam codd. extat, *num tantum se inflans, sic magna fuisset.*

Quæ lectio maxime perspicuum habet sensum, scilicet ranam, primum, ubi se leviter tantum inflasset, rogasse; deinde cum perstitisset se inflare donec dimidio major facta esset, tunc iterum rogasse. Waddelus goes on:

Anno 1722 ineunte, cum jam ab omnibus tereretur Cuningamii editio Horatiana quæ nuperrime in lucem prodierat, ego hanc meam de hoc loco opinionem, cum celeberrimo Snapio, et eruditissimis collegii Etonensis rectoribus et magistris, atque plerisque aliis viris doctis communicavi, illi omnes eam novam judicabant, et plerique tanquam verissimam probabant. Hoc ideo monendum putavi quia vidi nuper (si probe memini in Epistola Critica in Phædrum Bentleji), locum hunc eodem modo explicatum. Vide Waddeli Animadversationes, p. 68.

Wishing so far as we can to rescue so learned and illustrious a prelate as Bishop Hare from the imputation of gross plagiarism, we shall first produce the Bishop's words in his letter to Dr. Bland, and afterwards state our own opinion upon the complaints of Waddelus.

"Nihil mirum, tantæ eruditionis tantique acuminis viros in hoc loco restituendo frustra insudasse, cum toti animum eò intenderent, ubi nihil erat vitii; id enim in versu præcedente latet, et levi mutatione omne tollitur, si pro *fuisset* legamus *fuit? tum.* Et huc ipsa constructionis ratio eos ducere debebat, cum *num fuisset*, nisi plurimum fallor, dici nequeat, sed, num fuit? jam autem vide, quam recte omnia incedant

—— Illa rogare
Quantane? num tantum, sufflans se, magna fuit? tum (cum ex pulli silentio mentem ejus satis intelligeret) se iterum vehementer sufflans, et jam *major dimidio* facta, iterum interrogat, *num tantum?* pullus etiam-num tacet; quod cum toties repetitis vicibus frustra fecisset, tum demum pullus,
Non si te ruperis, inquit,

Par erls—Vides facili emendatione Horatium liberari ab infami illa macula, quam nec librariis imputari, nec ipsi condonari posse noster credidit?—V. p. 328, vol. ii. of Hare's Works.

Upon comparing the words of Hare with those of Waddelus, we think that the memory of the latter was defective, or that his judgment was confused. About the 318th line they agree entirely, but about the preceding line they differ widely. Hare rejects Cuningham's conjecture, fuisset, which Waddelus approves, and he proposes *fuit tum*, which did not occur to Waddelus, nor to Cuningham. Whether the Bishop was led by his own sagacity in the reading of line 318, or had heard from his Eton friends the opinion which Waddelus had communicated to Dr. Snape, we cannot determine. We certainly accede to the opinion of Hare and Waddelus, who would read major dimidio, num tantum: But we think that Bishop Hare's chief merit is in correcting the foregoing line, and the merit of that correction surely is quite his own.

We return to Dr. Combe's catalogue of the articles which he has admitted. Waddeli Animadvertiones criticæ in Loca quædam Virgilii, Horatii, Ovidii, Lucani, et super illis emendandis Conjecturæ. Having long ago read Waddelus, we were anxious to know how much information he had supplied for the Variorum edition: we shall place then the general result of our inquiries before our readers, and we shall produce, with all possible conciseness, the matter which our editor has neglected to use.

Waddelus considers forty passages of Horace. Upon thirty-four he offers conjectural emendations of the text, in two he would alter the punctuation,

in three he suggests interpretations of the sense, and in one he would transpose the words.

Nine emendations relate to such parts of Horace as are found in the first volume of the Variorum, and of these nine one only is omitted. In the second volume of the Variorum, Dr. C. out of 25 emendations has noticed only one, and as to the interpretations, the punctuations, and the transposition, they are passed by entirely. Now, if so much use was made of Waddelus in the first volume, we are naturally led to inquire why so little was made of him in the second. We are at a loss to determine whether the absence of so many articles is to be imputed to deliberate rejection, or accidental inadvertency, to the disapprobation or forgetfulness of Dr. C. If to disapprobation, we ask how a critic, who had deserved attention through the first volume, had forfeited his claim to it in the second; if to inadvertency, we lament the relaxation of diligence in the editor of the second volume, after so laudable an example of perseverance in the use made of Waddelus through the first. Again, if Dr. C.'s copy of Waddelus was marked, why did he not, like his coadjutor, avail himself of this advantage? and if it was not marked, why had he greater reluctance to select from Waddelus, through the whole of the second volume, than from Bentley, Lambin, Torrentius, Wakefield, Bp. Hurd, and Jason de Nores? we do not extend this question to Cuningham and the Explicationes of Bowyer (i. e. Markland), because the Editor, perhaps, had a chart to guide him in the

whole of his voyage through these little bays and shallows of criticism.

As we do not find any great disparity of excellence between the articles omitted in the Variorum by Dr. C. and those which are contained in it, we shall do Waddelus the same justice, which we have already done to Markland, and we trust that our readers will not be displeased with us for extracting so much matter from a book, which perhaps is not very easy for many scholars to procure.

Od. xii. Lib. i. v. 19. Occupavit Pallas honores.

W. would read occupabit. In vol. i. of the Var. this is the only emendation omitted, and it is (by mistake doubtless) unmarked, so as to leave no blame with Mr. H.

Sat. ii. B. i. v. 81. Hoc Cerinthe tuum tenerum est femur.

W. would read O Cerinthe tuæ tenerum est femur.

Sat. v. B. i. v. 6. —— Minus est gravis Appia tardis.

W. would read nimis for minus, and he found his conjecture supported by a Vatican manuscript.

Sat. vi. B. i. v. 53. Quo pueri magnis è centurionibus orti.

W. interprets the passage thus: "Quidam, per magnos pueros ortos è magnis centurionibus, intelligunt filios natalibus claros. An autem centuriones ita eminebant in Republica * *? Flavius docebat artem numerandi et ratiocinandi. Minime dubium quin poeta, hic, genus quoddam hominum sordidorum, nummos imprimis sectantium, taxet, qui, ut ipsi lucro tantum intenti sunt, liberos suas etiam discere volebant artes, quibus pecuniam coacervare possent * *. Itaque mihi videtur respicere fœnera-

tores, quos ideo forsan appellat *centuriones*, quia usura est centesima pars sortis."

Sat. vi. B. i. v. 116. Cœna ministratur pueris tribus.

W. supposing Horace not to have ordinarily employed three slaves at table, once thought of reading pueris scabris, and afterwards he conjectured putris tripus, to which he gives the preference, and quotes the old commentator on the place, who speaks of a mean marble table, or τρισκελὴς τράπεζα, called a Delphic table.

Sat. ix. B. i. v. 45. Nemo dexterius fortuna est usus.

W. would read deterius, and part of his interpretation runs thus: miror te nescire uti fortuna: adjutar aliquis tibi assumendus.

Sat. ix. B. i. v. 55. —— et est qui vincit; eoque
Difficiles aditus primus habet. Haud mihi deero.

W. would put a comma at *habet*, instead of a full stop, and for eoque he would read eo quòd. By an error of his memory or his printer, he puts non instead of haud after habet.

Sat. x. B. i. v. 48. Neque ego illi detrahere ausim, &c.

For ego illi detrahere, W. p. 62. would read, Lucili abstrahere.

Sat. x. B. i. v. 50. —— sæpe ferentem
Plura quidem tollenda relinquendis.

We give the substance of W.'s interpretation: De sensu horum verborum non convenit inter interpretes. Quidam dicta putant in favorem Lucilii, alii e contra in ejus vituperium. * * * Culpabatur Horatius quòd dixisset, Sat. iv. "Lucilium fluere lutulentum," verum etiam tunc addidit fuisse "quòd tollere posses;" Sat. iv. v. 11. quod hic fusius repetit, "sæpe ferentem plura relinquendis." Nisi autem

hæc in bonam partem accipiantur, nullâtenus diluit objecta.

B. ii. Sat. ii. v. 75. ———at simul assis
Miscueris elixa, simul conchylia turdis;
Dulcia se in bilem vertent.

Male distinctus, says W. videtur locus, et dulcia jungendum cum conchylia in hunc modum.

——— simul conchylia turdis
Dulcia.

Sat. iii. B. ii. v. 220. ——— ergo ubi prava
Stultitia, hic summa est insania.

W. would read ibi parva, and reasons thus. Si quis agnam gestet lectica, eamque tractet pro filia, illi destinando maritum, ab omnibus tenebitur pro mente capto: Sed hujus levis et tolerabilis est stultitia, si cum scelere illius conferatur, qui gnatam suam devovet pro agna "hæc summa erit insania."

Sat. iii. B. ii. v. 318. Major dimidio num tanto? We have already given W.'s reading num tantum.

Sat. vi. B. ii. v. 29. Quid vis insane, et quas res agis?

W. after rejecting the opinions of Bentley and Cuningham, would read quid tibi vis? isne? ecquas res agis?

Sat. vii. B. ii. v. 10.
Vixit inæqualis, clavum ut mutaret in horas:
Ædibus ex magnis subito se conderet,

W. alters the punctuation thus:

Vixit inæqualis: clavum ut mutaret in horas
Ædibus ex magnis:—

Lib. i. Epist. i. v. 84. Si dixit dives.

W. would read Davus. Ad nomen heri quærebam, says he, an aliquid dictum esset de servis, idque mihi videor deprehendisse, exigua mutatione pro *Dives* legendo *Davus*, quod nomen vulgo ponitur pro servo subdolo et callido, qui semper se immiscet negotiis domini. Saltem sensus non repugnabit; si

servus præsenti domino Baias laudaverit, ille statim illuc commigrabit.

Epist. x. v. 47. Imperat aut servit collecta pecunia cuique; Pro *aut*, says W. vix dubitem reponere *haud*. Per pecuniam collectam hic intelligit eam quæ non in usum comparatur, sed in arcam asservanda reponitur.

Epist. xiii. v. 12. Sic positum servabis onus.

W. would read si for sic.

Epist. xv. v. 11.——Non mihi Cumas
Est iter aut Baias, læva stomachosus habena,
Dicet eques.

Cur equo succenseat Horatius, says W. qui suetum iter prosequitur? Majori cum ratione quereretur equus se verberari, cum rectam insisteret viam——Quare forte pro *eques* legendum *equus*: Quamvis et *eques* etiam pro jumento usurpatur.

Though we approve not of Waddelus's conjecture, we will give an instance or two of the use of eques for equus.

Denique vi magna quadrupes eques, atque elephantei
Projiciunt sese. Ennius.
At non quadrupedes equites. Idem.
—— Equitem docuere sub armis
Insultare solo. Virg. Georg. iii. v. 116.

Where Servius says, Hic *equitem* sine dubio *equum* dicit, maxime cum inferat, insultare solo.

Epist. xv. v. 29. Impransus qui non civem dignosceret hoste.

W. interprets impransus by bene pransus.*

Epist. xviii. v. 3. Ut matrona meretrici dispar erat atque
Discolor, infido scurræ distabit amicus.
W. reads Ut matrona meretrici dispar erit, *æque*
Discolor infido scurræ, &c.

Upon the last line of this epistle, the Editor has honoured a less probable conjecture than the foregoing with a place in the Variorum Edition. For det vitam det opes, W. reads, det vel non det opes.

---

* Marcilius interpretatur *imprensum bene suburratum*, et inde petulantem—sed destituitur, ut puto, ab exemplo.—Gesner's note in h. l.

Epist. xix. v. 13. Exiguæque togæ simulet textore Catonem
Quidam codices, says W. habent exiguaque toga. Quid si forte scriptum,

— Si quis vultu torvo ferus, ac pede nudo
Exiguaque toga, simuletque ex ore Catonem;

vel admittendo Cæsuram,

Exiguaque toga simulet, exque ore Catonem.

Huic lectioni favet, quod Lambinus dicit quosdam viros doctos affirmare scriptum in quodam cod. *tesquore*.

Lib. ii. Epist. i. v. 31.

Nil intra est oleam, nil extra est in nuce duri.

W. proposes nil intra est olea in, and for the position of in, he quotes, among other instances, the following:

— Quibus *e* corpus nobis et viscera constent. Lucret. iii. 376.
Injiciunt ipsis *ex* vincula sertis. Virg. Ecl. vi. 19.
Sed fugam *in* se tamen nemo convertitur.
Plaut. Amph. A. i. S. v. v. 83.
Nec quo *ab* caveas. Plaut. Asin. i. i. 106.

Epist. i. B. ii. v. 70. Memini quæ plagosum mihi parvo
Orbilium dictare.

For quæ Wad. proposes quia, and assigns a reason more likely, we fear, to have weight with schoolboys, than their masters.

Epist. i. B. ii. 143.

—— Sylvanum lacte piabant,
Floribus et vino genium memorem brevis ævi.

W. would read memores, referring to Agricola, v. 139.

Mr. Wakefield, as will be hereafter seen, has the same conjecture.

Epist. i. B. ii. v. 158. —— et grave virus
Munditiæ pepulere.

W. long doubted the genuineness of this reading, but suppressed his doubts in obedience to the authority of consenting manuscripts. Upon reading the notes of Rutgersius he found that critic proposing vi rus, and then he modestly offers his own, *raris*, We, upon casting our eye into the Variorum, were

forcibly struck with the following words among the vv. LL. *grave virus conj. Rutgersius.** First, we saw that *virus* was not a various reading; and secondly, we had read in Waddelus that Rutgersius separated the words into vi rus; we turned to Bentley's note, and there we found that Waddelus is right, and that the Var. Edit. is wrong.—Bentley's words are these: Infelix sane acumen Aurati et Rutgersii qui pro virus divisis syllabis vi rus substituere voluerunt. We have produced Bentley's words because Dr. C. has not produced them, and because we are under the necessity of observing an instance in which the *division* of syllables is, perhaps, confounded with their *union*. As the Editor consults original writers in order to correct the annotators, the readers of the Var. Edit. must now and then consult the annotators in order to adjust the text.

Epist. i. B. ii. v. 164.

Tentavit quoque rem si digne vertere posset;

W. for rem, would read *dein*.

Lib. ii. Epist. ii. v. 80.

—Cunctata, or as the Var. reads, contracta sequi vestigia vatum.

W. after noticing Bentley's reading *non tacta*, proposes non cuncta.

A. P. v. 63. —— Sive receptus
Terra Neptunus, classes aquilonibus arcet
Regis opus.

W. found in a Turin manuscript receptos, with the letters in different ink. In a Vatican manuscript he observed that the original writing had been changed, and that different ink had been employed

* Query, does conj. in the Var. Edit. mean conjungit or conjicit?

to write receptus Neptunus. He thus proceeds—Forte ergo legendum,

Sive recepto
Terra Neptuno, classes aquilonibus arcet
Regis opus.

Id est, sive agger ab Augusto extructus, opus vere Regium, immisso mari naves tuetur contra ventos.

A. P. 114. —— Davusne loquatur an heros,

W. would read herusne.

A. P. 248. Offenduntur enim quibus est equus et pater et res.

Verba, says W. videntur transposita, et unius vocis in suum locum reductione forsan vera restituetur lectio; ita scil.

Offendentur enim pater, et quibus est equus et res.

Sic planus erit sensus, offenditur pater, sive per hanc vocem intelligas senatores, sive eos qui liberos habent; illi enim cum maxime conspicui sint in rep. exemplo modestiæ aliis præire debent; hi quia metuunt filiis, ne ipsorum mores corrumpantur, dum obscœnis assuescant. Offenduntur etiam quibus est equus et res, id est, equites et locupletes, qui honestiorem locum obtinent inter cives.

A. P. v. 461. Si curet quis opem ferre et dimittere funem.

W. found curat in some manuscripts, and therefore he would read currat, which approaches to curret, quoted by Dr. C. in vv. LL. from Zeunius.

Upon the merit of the preceding emendations we shall neither attempt to direct the judgment of our readers, nor in detail insist upon our own. But we contend generally, that they are not more improbable than those which are admitted into the first volume of the Variorum, and if Dr. C. selected one in the second volume, he might, without any impeachment of his sagacity, have selected more.

In the Catalogue Dr. C. mentions Taylor's Elements of Civil Law. Upon the 6th line of Od. xxix. B. iii. Taylor is very properly introduced to illustrate and defend semper-udum. But in the second volume of the Var. the learned critic totally

disappears, and as the Var. Editor has omitted the only two remaining conjectures which occur in Taylor's book, we shall produce them, especially as we have no hesitation in acknowledging that we think both ingenious.

Sat. i. Lib. i. v. 29. Perfidus hic caupo.

Taylor in p. 220, gives the conjecture of a learned lawyer, Perfidus hic Cautor.* He decides not upon the reading, but produces a number of passages to illustrate the technical words respondere and cavere in the Roman Law, and as we have mentioned the conjecture, we will subjoin, from Taylor, a few instances of the use of cavere to support it.

Cicero, in his letter to Appius Pulcher.

L. Valerium Juris consultum valde tibi commendo; sed ita etiam, si non est Juris consultus. Melius enim ei *cavere* volo, quam ipse aliis solet. Fam. Epist. iii. 1.

He writes thus in a letter to Trebatius, the great lawyer:

Tu qui ceteris *cavere* didicisti, in Britannia ne ab essedariis decipiaris, *caveto*. Fam. Epist. vii. 6.

Ovid de Arte Amandi. B. i. 83.

—— capitur consultus amore,
Quique aliis cavit, non cavit ipse sibi.

Plautus in Captiv. 1 A. ii. S. 2. 5.

Etiam cum cavisse ratus est, sæpe is cautor cautus est.

Taylor, p. 421, writes thus;

"Slaves in the Greek and Roman comedies, are often very distinct characters. Nay, they have been so well contrasted upon the stage, that some critics have ventured to restore this passage in Horace, in conformity to that opposition of character. A. P. v.

* Schrader, p. 71, of the Emendations, reads providus hic cautor, and seems not to have known that part of his conjecture was anticipated.

114. Intererit multum Davusne loquatur, Erosne. Every one that looks into inscriptions or reads the Digest, will find, that Eros was a very common name for a servant, as well as Davus. And this is also, I apprehend, more conformable to the MSS. Davus was a crafty knave, and Eros a plain servant."

Whether Dr. C. knew of these passages in Taylor, we decide not; why he omitted them we conjecture not. But we mean to give no offence by saying, that Dr. C.'s coadjutor was apprised of their existence.

Dr. C. in his Catalogue has given a place to the Sylva Critica of Mr. Wakefield; and we, upon comparing Wakefield's Sylva with the Variorum Edition, find new reason for bringing forward supplemental matter. The first volume of Wakefield contains eight emendations, and of these eight Dr. C. produces not one. The second volume of Wakefield contains three emendations and three changes of punctuation. The three emendations are omitted in the Var. Two of those changes of punctuation are omitted also, and one of them is produced, not from the Sylva Critica, where it occurs, p. 99, but from the Observationes in Horatium, where it may also be found, 79th page; and this we affirm the more positively, because the Variorum exhibits every word contained in the Observations, and omits every word contained in the Sylva Critica. From these premises we infer, without any hesitation, that the Var. Editor has not very carefully consulted the two books of the Sylva Critica, though in the catalogue he professes to have employed them in his selections

for the Var. Edit. In justice to Mr. Wakefield and for the conviction of our readers, we enter upon the following detail—Sylva Critica, p. 1st.

Epist. ii. B. ii. v. 105. Obturem patulas impune legentibus aures.

Mr. Wakefield, p. 19. proposes obtundem (which we consider as a mere typographical error for obtundam) instead of obturem.

Horat. B. ii. Od. 3. v. 13.

Huc vina, et unguenta, et nimium breves
Flores amœnæ ferre jube rosæ.

For amœnæ, Mr. Wakefield, p. 149, would read Amyntæ.

His words are, Puerum scilicet ejus pro more alloquitur Horatius, cujus nomen infelicem immutationem passum est.—He then quotes, Serta mihi Phyllis legeret, cantaret Amyntas.—VIRG.

This emendation reminds us of a note in the Notitia Poetarum Anthologicorum, p. 66,* which we will bring forward, as it contains a verbal emendation of Horace. Maximè frequens in pueris Meleagri, Muisci nomen. Quod frequens in vernarum nominibus, præsertim nondum adultorum, fuisse constat ex Polybio, page 424. l. 9. edit. Wechel. et Horatii, B. 2. 9, 10. ubi vulgo prave editum circumfertur Mystem, sed Muiscum restituendum est.

Tu semper urges flebilibus modis
Muiscum ademptum.

Od. 38. v. 5. b. 1. Simplici myrto nihil allabores
Sedulus, curo.

Mr. Wakefield, p. 150, would read curæ; after making this conjecture, he turned to Bentley's Horace, and found it confirmed, a quodam codice ma-

* Subjoined to Anthologiæ Græcæ à Constant. Cephala conditæ libri tres. Oxford, 1766.

nuscripto, quem miror, says he, summum criticum suæ correctioni posthabuisse, cum ipsissimum dederit Atticum leporem, cujus potissimum fuit studiosus noster. It is curious to observe the opinions of great critics on the reading of this line. Even Baxter upon this place praises Bentley, and reads cura. Cuningham, like Wakefield, would read curæ. Gesner is contented with curo, and Klotzius says, illud *curo* exercuit interpretum ingenium, et exercebit.

Lib. ii. Od. xi. v. 15. Canos odorati capillos.

Wakefield, p. 51, proposes coronati.

Lib. iii. Od. iv. v. 21. —— vester in arduos
Tollor Sabinos.

Wakefield, p. 151, reads arduum et Sabinus.

Od. xiv. L. iii. v. 11. Jam virum expertæ.

Wakefield, p. 152, reads jam virûm expertes. The Var. mentions not Wakefield, though it gives the same reading from Cuningham and Sanadon.

Od. ix. L. iii. v. 11. —— decedunt amores.

Wakefield, in p. 152, reads labores for amores.

Od. x. L. iii. v. 16. —— supplicibus tuis
Parcas.

Wakefield, p. 153, reads suppliciis.

Od. iv. L. iv. v. 29. Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis:
Est in juvencis, est in equis vigor
Patrum.

Wakefield, p. 154, puts a comma at fortibus, and joins bonis with juvencis. In the Variorum not the least notice is taken of Mr. Wakefield; in the notes, however, we have the same reading from Bentley, Cuningham, and Janus.

Epist. ii. L. i. v. 144. —— memorem brevis ævi.

Wakefield, p. 155, would read memores to be joined with agricolæ, and we have before produced

the same emendation from Waddelus. But the Var. is silent about both these critics.

Sylva Critica, Part 2.

L. iii. Od. 27. v. 26. —— et scatentem
Belluis pontum, mediasque fraudes
Palluit audax.

Mr. Wakefield, p. 17, reads thus:

—— *at* scatentem
Belluis pontum *media*, *atque* fraudes
Palluit audax. ——

Od. xxxv. L. i. v. 5. Te pauper ambit sollicita prece
Ruris colonus; te dominam æquoris,
Quicunque Bithyna lacessit
Carpathium pelagus carina. ——

Wakefield, p. 41, thus alters the punctuation:

Te pauper ambit sollicita prece
Ruris colonus; te dominam, æquoris
Quicunque Bithynâ lacessit
Carpathium pelagus carinâ.

He illustrates pelagus æquoris by πέλαγος θαλάσσης, from Apollonius Rhodius, L. ii. v. 610.

Sat. vii. L. ii. v. 85.

———— contemnere honores
Fortis; et in seipso totus teres atque rotundus,
Externi ne quid valeat per læve morari.

Wakefield, p. 57, points the passage thus:

———— contemnere honores
Fortis, et in seipso totus; teres atque rotundus,
Externi ne quid valeat per læve morari.

Mr. W. ingenuously confesses, that before he thought of this punctuation, he had not read Bentley's note which proposes it; and we add that Dr. C. has judiciously inserted that note in the Variorum edition.

Epod. xiv. v. 7. Inceptos, olim promissum carmen, Iambos.

Wakefield, p. 99, would transfer the comma from inceptos to olim, and he does not take notice of having proposed the same change in his observa-

tions. We have already stated that Dr. C. has admitted Mr. Wakefield's conjecture into the notes upon the Epodes, and that he took it not from the Sylva Critica, published in 1790, but from the observations, published in 1776. We read with care and with pleasure three parts of the Sylva Critica soon after their respective appearance. From the fourth part we have lately derived much instruction, and, in due time, shall bear a fuller testimony to its merits in the British Critic.

As Dr. C. has not inserted the third part of the Sylva Critica, published at Cambridge 1792, in his catalogue, he is not responsible for its contents. We shall, however, extend our principles of introducing supplemental matter, and for this purpose we shall enable our readers to enrich the margin of the Variorum edition with such emendations as we have collected from the third part of Mr. Wakefield's Sylva Critica, and from his edition of Virgil's Georgics, published at Cambridge 1788.

Ars Poet. v. 99. Non satis est pulchra esse poemata, dulcia sunto.

Satis multa, si bene memini, de voce pulchra noster Hurdius, sed vir ingeniosus nihil extricat.

We could wish that Mr. Wakefield, in speaking of so illustrious a prelate as Dr. Hurd, would have employed his eyes instead of trusting to his memory. Whatever may be the merits of the explanation, with which Mr. Wakefield is dissatisfied, the Bishop* is answerable only for approving it,

* However rough in appearance may be the foregoing words, which we have cited from Mr. Wakefield, he speaks with great and just respect of the Bishop, in a note on line 46 of the third Georgic. We will quote his words, to efface any

and if it was written, as we have heard, by an excellent and celebrated member of the Established Church, who lives at Winchester, we agree with the general opinion of Dr. Hurd, when he pronounces him "an ingenious person who knows how to unite philosophy with criticism, and, to all that is elegant in taste, to add what is most just and accurate in science." See Hurd's note.

As to the sense of pulcher, we shall lay before our readers Mr. Wakefield's words: "Non satis est, inquit summus artifex, secundum artem et regulas mox præscriptas, poemata perfici; non sufficit pulchra esse scilicet, et sine culpa: necesse est etiam, ut sint tenera, mollia, dulcia, ad affectus excitandos suavi artificio concinnata." Hæc est mens auctoris, quam verbis luculentissimis aperit nobis Ascensius et Acron.

Od. iii. L. ii. v. 11. —— Obliquo laborat
Lympha fugax trepidare rivo.

We shall give Mr. Wakefield's words as we find them in p. 51. Et constructionem (by an error of the press, it is constructionam, in the Sylva Critica) paullo perplexiorem enodatam dabimus, quam nescio an aliquis ad hunc diem perspexerit. *Et lympha fugiens per obliquum rivum laborat trepidare*, non sine difficultate, per obstantes scilicet lapillos et serpentem alveum, cursum suum promovet: ideoque moram jucundam nectit, et suaviter interea susurrat.

---

bad impression that may be made on the mind of the reader by Mr. W.'s language, when he speaks of the word pulchra: "Quæ de his tribus versibus (i. e. Virgilii), disseruit Ricardus Hurd, Episcopus Wigorniensis, doctrina viri istius exquisita, atque ingenio eleganti prorsus digna sunt."

Sat. i. L. i. v. 29. Perfidus hic caupo,

Wakefield, p. 77, accumulates many passages to illustrate St. Paul's use of καπηλεύοντες, cap. ii. epist. ii. ad Corinth.; and at the close he writes what we shall quote, not from our assent to the criticism, but from our good humour with the pleasantry — Denique, mirari subit, doctos homines ullo modo velle aliam lectionem in Horatium importare:

Perfidus HIC caupo:

Hic nempe, quem ante memoravimus. Nec, piget dicere! verbo magis apto uti poterat poeta. Utinam a se hoc opprobrium causidici vellent amovere, et leges cauponarent minus! *Dis aliter visum.*

A. P. l. 161. Imberbis juvenis tandem custode remoto ——
Sat. vi.l. 1. v.81. Ipse mihi custos incorruptissimus.

Mr. Wakefield, p. 89, tells us, that by custos is meant the Pædagogus in the former passage literally, and in the latter by allusion. We think him right, and we suppose that custode in the A. P. has been long understood by every learned reader in the same manner.

Sat. iii. B. ii. v. 72. Malis ridentem alienis.

Mr. W. p. 105, gives this interpretation: immodice ridentem, nec genis exercendis parcentem, quasi alienis; et proinde nihil doloris et incommodi hinc sperantem.

He quotes from the Etymologicum Magnum, ἑτερόγναθος ἵππος, ὁ σκληρόστομος, οἷον ὁ τοῖς γνάθοις ὡς μὴ ἰδίοις χρώμενος, and from the Pan. of Isocrates, ὥσπερ ἐν ἀλλοτρίαις ψύχαις μέλλοντες κινδυνεύειν, and from Thucydides, B. i. S. 70. ἔτι δὲ τοῖς μὲν σώμασιν ἀλλοτριωτάτοις ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως χρῶνται, τῇ δὲ γνώμῃ οἰκειοτάτῃ ἐς τὸ πράσσειν τι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς.

We shall take the liberty of quoting Eustathius on the passage, in order to illustrate Mr. Wakefield's interpretation:

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὸ γνάθμοις γελᾷν ἀλλοτρίοις, καὶ νῦν ἐπιπολά-

*Δει λεγέσθαι παροιμιακῶς, τοὺς γάρ τοι ἐφ' οἷς μὴ ἄξιον γελῶντας ἐκ θυμοῦ, ἢ ἀμηχανίας τινὸς, ξέναις φαμὲν γελᾶν παρείαις· ὥσπερ καὶ τοὺς πρὸς βίαν ἐσθιόντας, ἀλλοτρίοις ἐσθίειν γνάθμοις, ὡς τῶν οἰκείων δήθεν ὀκνούντων· καὶ ἐστὶν ὁ τοιοῦτος γέλως, ἕτερός τις παρὰ τὸν σαρδόνιον. * * * Ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλως, σύμβολόν ἐστι τὸ ῥηθὲν τοῦ ἐξεστηκέναι τοὺς μνηστῆρας ἑαυτῶν, ὡς οἷον μήδε ἐν σώμασιν εἶναι. Διὸ καὶ ἀπηλλοτρίωνταί πως αὐτοί τε τῶν οἰκείων σωμάτων, καὶ αὐτα ἐκείνων, ὥστε δοκεῖν ὡς ἀλλοτρίοις γελᾶν γνάθμοις.* Vide p. 739. Eustath. Hom. vol. ii. Edit. Basil. 1559; and in Odyssey xx. v. 347. *Οἵδ' ἤδη γναθμοῖσι γελῴων ἀλλοτρίοισιν.*

Od. xiv. L. ii. v. 9.

Compescit unda, scilicet omnibus,
Quicunque terræ munere vescimur,
Enaviganda.

Mr. Wakefield, p. 117, would read munera for munere.

Leaving the probability of this emendation to the judgment of learned readers, we refer them to an excellent note of Broukhusius, p. 264, on the following line of Tibullus:

—— Sacras innoxia laurus
Vescar.

Broukhusius, with great success, vindicates the use of an accusative after vescar.

Od. xxxi. Lib. i. 12. Vina Syra reparata merce.

Mr. Wakefield, p. 187, approves of Bentley's interpretation, and adds reparata, i. e. condita, renovata, Syris aromatibus, sua scilicet ipsius mercatura. Hic est *ὁ οἶνος οἰνώδης* Hippocratis.

In Mr. Wakefield's edition of the Georgics, p. 24, he reconsiders and explains, at some length, the coalescence of vowels into one syllable, at the end of a line, and he again mentions his conjecture of nec for aut in

Sat. ii. B ii. v. 22. —— Nec ostrea
Nec scarus.

Upon this opinion of Mr. Wakefield we shall

speak at large on some future occasion, and at present we shall only say, that Mr. W. had made the same conjecture in his observations published in 1776, and that his words are printed faithfully in the Variorum, p. 159, vol. ii. In p. 35 of the Geor. Mr. W. would point the following passage in this manner:

Prudens futuri temporis, exitum
Caliginosa nocte premit Deus.

Wakefield joins temporis with prudens; whereas it is generally, and we think justly, supposed to follow exitum. In p. 37 Mr. W. quotes, from the 14th ode of the fourth book, diluviem meditatur agris, but acknowledges the force of Bentley's arguments for reading minatatur. In p. 41 Mr. W. would read tu* pulses (for pulsas) omne quod obstat, in the 30th line of the 6th Sat. B. ii. Mr. W. in p. 73 of the Georgics, offers an emendation of the following passage in Od. xvi. B. ii.

—— Quid terras alio calentes
Sole mutamus? patriæ quis exsul
Se quoque fugit?

He reads patria for patriæ, and points the line thus:

Sole mutamus patria?

P. 78. He has many emendations.

Od. ix. Lib. ii. v. 21. Medumque flumen, gentibus additum
Victis, minores volvere vertices.

He would read minorem, and quotes from Sat. iii. B. ii. tanto certare minorem. Now he had made the same emendation, and produced the same line to support it, in p. 78. of his observations; and

* Markland also reads pulses in p. 93 of the Epistola Critica.

of this we are the more desirous to inform our readers, because this emendation is judiciously admitted into the Variorum, and because Mr. W. in this very note has inserted two conjectures which occur in other parts of his writings. One we have already given, and now we shall bring forward the other. In Od. xxvii. l. iii. he reads *at* for et before scatentem; but this correction is found in the Silva Critica, p. 16. part 2.

Mr. W. objects to medias fraudes. His words are: "Quid autem sibi vult medias fraudes, hoc equidem nunquam potui discere, aut divinare, et aliis explicandum vellem." We believe that fraudes means pericula cæca. It is used for damnum or periculum, by Horace, in Od. xix. B. ii. v. 19.

Nodo coerces viperino
Bistonidum sine fraude crines.

Where the old scholiast says, sine noxa. So Virgil, in l. 72. Æn. 10.

Quis deus in fraudem, quæ dura potentia nostri est?

We shall add the note of Servius. In fraudem autem in periculum: ita enim in jure lectum est. Fraudi erit illa res, id est periculo.—Heyne says, in fraudem: est malum, ἄτη, ut toties periculum Servius interpretatur.

Mr. W. in p. 78. would read, Ode xxxvii. Lib. i. v. 25. Ausa ut jacentem for et. And then he writes as follows: "Hinc etiam recte explicandus est Horatius et distinguendus ad Od. l. 4. 4. 53. ubi misere rem agunt interpretes pro sua sagacitate.

Gens, quæ cremato fortis ab Ilio,
Jactata Tuscis æquoribus sacra,
Natosque, maturosque patres
Pertulit Ausonias ad urbes:

Duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus
Nigræ feraci frondis in Algido,
Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumque ferro.

i. e. ut ilex ducit opes, ita hæc gens fortior evasit ob crematum Ilium et sacra jactata, non gens.

Raptos qui ex hoste penates
Classe veho mecum, Æn. i. v. 382.

—— feror exsul in altum
Cum sociis, natoque, Penatibus, et magnis Dîs. Æn. iii. 2.

Mr. W. p. 83, corrects the 38th line of Epist. xvii. b. i.

Quid? qui pervenit, fecitne viriliter?

Mr. W. reads provenit for pervenit.

We shall give Mr. W.'s words from p. 89, upon a very important passage in the Ars Poet.

Syllaba longa brevi subjecta vocatur Iambus
Per citus; unde etiam trimetris accrescere jussit
Nomen Iambeis. Cum senos redderet ictus,
Primus ad extremum similis sibi, non ita pridem,
Tardior ut paulo graviorque veniret ad aures,
Spondeos stabiles in jura paterna recepit
Commodus et patiens, v. 251.

i. e. Longa syllaba post brevem vocatur Iambus; pes citus, unde (ex qua celeritate, ut optime vetus interpres) nomen citis (v. Od. 1. 16. 24. ut a χώλοις ἰάμβοις distinguerentur) jussit dari trimetris Iambeis. Cum vero hic Iambus ab initio versus ad finem similis sibi ictus omnes suos redderet, non ita pridem, &c. quæ sequuntur enim plana per se cuivis sunt.

We believe that Mr. W.'s interpretation is not to be found in any edition of Horace; but we assure him that, long before the publication of his Virgil, it had occurred to us, and that we were accustomed to illustrate it by the following verses of Ovid:*

* Burman, in his notes on these lines, mentions the strange opinion of a critic, who supposed Ovid to speak of the catalectic iambic, and refers him to Merula, and the notes of Bersman, to be convinced, or rather informed, that the poet speaks of the Scazon.

Liber in adversos hostes stringatur Iambus,
Seu celer, extremum seu trahat ille pedem.
Remed. Amor. v. 377.

It may be worth while to remark, *ἐν παρόδῳ*, that Milton, in forty-one Latin scazons, has fallen into twenty-three mistakes; for in nineteen instances he uses the spondee, and in four instances he uses the anapæst, in the fifth place before the final spondee. This licence is admitted into Greek scazons (vid. Hephæst. p. 17. Ed. Pau.) but never into Latin. We shall give the words of Terentianus Maurus:

Sed quia jugatos scandimus pedes istos,
Pæona fieri perspicis pedem in fine:
Epitritus nam primus implet hanc partem
Brevis locata quum sit ante tres longas.
Quare cavendum est, ne licentiâ suetâ
Spondeon, aut qui procreantur ex illo,
Dari putemus posse nunc loco quinto;
Ne deprehensæ quatuor simul longæ
Parum sonoro fine destruant versum.

See P. i. 263. Mattaire, Corp. Poet.

Avantius and Fabricius, in their dissertation upon the metre of Seneca, prefixed to Schroeder's edition of the Tragedies, give one instance of a scazon with an anapæst in the fifth place.

Cum Dardana tecta Dorici raperent ignes.
L. 612. Agamemnon.

But they are mistaken: for the true reading is raperetis. The verse occurs in a chorus of Monostrophics. It is an iambic trimeter hypercatalectic, and follows a troch. trim. hyperc. Here we should have an additional instance of the resemblance between Greek and Roman verse; for if Dardana be the true reading, two syllables of the second foot are in the first hyperdisyllabic word, where the foot is an anapæst. Now Dawes, in the fifth section of the Miscellanea Critica, maintains, that in Greek or Latin iambics the ictus rhythmicus falls on the last syllable of iambics, spondees, and anapæsts, and on the penultimate of Dactyls and Tribrachs admitted into Iambic verse: *αὐτίκα μάλα* is, we believe, an exception in Greek; but the rule certainly holds good in the tragic and comic writers among the Greeks, and in Terence. Let us pursue this subject a little further: Avantius and Fabricius tell us, that in Seneca there are only two instances of the scazon iambus, and that these two occur in the Agamemnon:

Cum Dardana tecta Dorici raperent ignes,
Fatale munus Danaum traximus nostra.

It has been already observed, that the true reading in the former line is *raperetis*, and that the verse, therefore, ceases to be a scazon, and becomes an iamb. trimet. hypercat. Now in the text of Seneca the second line is thus read,

Danaumque fatale munus duximus nostra.

Here the metre is corrupt. It is of little consequence whether we read *traximus* with Avantius, or *duximus* with Schroeder; but *que*, which Avantius omits, is necessary to the construction. The transposition of one word will restore the metre,

Danaumque munus duximus fatale nostra.

Here we must observe, that lines 611 and 612 correspond to lines 626 and 627: in each instance we have a trim. troch. hypercat. followed by a trim. iamb. hypercat.

In the earlier part of this note, we said Terence, because Mr. Dawes, who had corrected Andr. Prol. 23. and Eunuch. 2. 2. 23. says, (p. 212. Ed. Burgess,) "Nullus dubito quin pauca admodum, quæ hodie apud Terent. contra repræsentantur, ad *ἀκρίβειαν* a Græcis servatam sint exigenda; præsertim cum levi ubique manu fieri possit." We shall not for the present controvert the position

But upon further consideration we abandoned our opinion, and we think that upon the meaning

---

about Terence; but we deliberately omitted the name of Plautus, and we shall now justify that omission by a series of examples, in which Plautus has not conformed to the rule which Dawes affirms to have been observed by Terence.

Hanc fabulam, inquam, hinc Juppiter hodie ipse aget.
Prologue to Amphitryo, v. 94.

Ita mihi videntur omnia, mare, terra, cœlum consequi.
Amphit. Act 5. Sc. 1. v 3.

Cum que in potestate habuimus, ea amisimus. Captiv. A. 1. S. 2. v. 40.

Multis et multigeneribus opus est tibi. Id. v. 56.

Oculorum præstringat aciem in acie hostibus. Mil. Glor. A. 1. S. 1. v. 4.

Objurgare pater hæc me noctes et dies. Mercat. Act. 1. Sc. 1.

We know that with very little trouble we could collect more instances from Plautus; but those which we have adduced are sufficient to show that implicit credit is not to be given to Dawes, when he tells us, without any qualification, "Nec vero in accentuum ratione vel comicis Latinis majorem permitti licentiam mihi persuasum est." (p. 212.) From the very imperfect state in which the fragments of Pacuvius, Afranius, Accius, and other old dramatic writers have come down to us, it is often difficult to speak with confidence upon the structure of their verse; but in justice to Mr. Dawes, we must state that, with one or two doubtful exceptions, their general practice is strictly conformable to his opinion. We shall ever admire the sagacity of Dawes in his remarks on the Greek writers; and our ears are exquisitely sensible of the effect which their delicacy and correctness must have produced upon an Athenian audience: hence, with the exception mentioned above to αὐτίκα μάλα, we shall admit the canon of Dawes, and recommend it, if recommendation be necessary, to the Editors of Greek dramatic writers: "Severiores Musas coluisse video poetas Atticos quam quæ in vocis hyperdissyllabæ ultimam correptam accentum cadere paterentur." (P. 211. *Misc. Crit.*) The ground of this practice, as we have above remarked, was a canon laid down in p. 190, where Dawes tells us: "In metris iambicis iambi, spondei, et anapæsti in ultimam, tribrachi, et dactyli, in mediam —— ictus cadit." Our ears are prepared for accuracy in the iambics of the older writers, Solon, Simonides, &c. though the recitation of their verses was not accompanied with music. But, when we consider the gradual changes which have been introduced into the iambic measure of the Greeks, and even of the pronunciation of the language, we must feel some degree of surprise, as well as delight, that even in compositions not dramatic, the canon of Dawes was generally observed for so many ages. To those who take an interest in these metrical questions, and admire, as we do, the discernment of Dawes, the following references made in support of what he has just now said on the long continued practice of the Greeks, will not be unacceptable. See the iambics of Solon, vol. i. p. 73. and of Simonides, p. 124. the scazons of Aischrio, p. 189. the iambics of Phædimus, p 261. the scazons of Theocritus, p. 381. 382. and his iambics, p. 380. the trimeter catalectics of Phalecus, p. 421. the iambics of Philippus, vol. ii. p. 216. 219. 221. of Heraclides, p. 261. of Pallas, p. 420. 422. 430. of Cometas, vol. iii. p. 16. In the inscriptions, p. 26. 27. 29. 30. the verses of Leo, p. 128. 129. 130. the ἀναθήματα, p. 140. the ἐπιγράμματα ἀδέσποτα, p. 245. 248. 256. 263. 266. 267. 278. 281. 286. 289. 300. 301. 314. the αἰνίγματα, p. 320. 324. 332.

To the foregoing passages, which are to be found in Brunck's Analecta, may be added the dimeter trochees of Archilochus, p. 42. vol. 1. corrected by Brunck; the iambics trimeter ibid., the tetrameter trochaics ibid. p. 43. In

of Horace light may be thrown from Terentianus Maurus. After the invocation of the Iambic, in six pure stanzas, Terentianus thus proceeds:

Vides ut icta verba raptet impetus:
Brevemque crebra consequendo longula
Citum subinde volvat arctius sonum:
Iambus ipse sex enim locis manet,
Et inde nomen inditum est senario.
Sed ter feritur, hinc trimetrus dicitur,
Scandendo binos quòd pedes conjungimus;
Quæ causa cogat non morabor edere.
Nam mox poetæ (ne nimis secans brevis
Lex hæc iambi verba pauca admitteret,
Dum parva longam semper alterno gradu
Urget, nec aptis exprimi verbis sinit
Sensus, aperte dissidente regulâ,
Spondeon, et quos iste pes esse creat,

---

carm. 16. Brunck properly corrects the 7th line, by reading ἰὰν for ἵνα: he leaves the 8th line uncorrected; but for ἰνάλιον we must read ἐνάλιον, and for σφὶ, σφὶν. See also trochees of Archilochus in *carm.* 18. p. 44, iambics, p. 45. 46. 47.

The learned reader must be well aware, that some of the passages, to which we have referred in Brunck's Analecta, were written when the pronunciation of the Greek language was very corrupt, and when the ordinary rules of the iambic verse were either not known or not understood. Yet, amidst all these corruptions, and all that ignorance, the Greek writers were led by their ear not to let what Dawes calls the *metrical ictus* fall upon the "ultimam correptam vocis hyperdissyllabæ." No scholar will be displeased with us for extending our references to verses, which are scattered over the *Bibliotheca Græca* of Fabricius. See Emanuelis Philes Iambi Sepulchrales in Phacrasen, p. 542. vol. x. Ed. Hamburgi, 1721. the Carm. of Eman. Phile. in Obitum G. Pachymeræ, p. 1719. vol. x. the verses erroneously ascribed to Pisidas, p. 477. vol. i. the Sphæra Empedoclis, p. 478. where in the 4th line we must read γονάσι for γονύασι, though in the 37th line the writer uses γονύασι as necessary to the verse. See many Greek iambics, from p. 28. to p. 30. in the first Dissertation of Leo Allatius de Libris Ecclesiasticis Græcorum, published at Hamb. 1712. and inserted by Fabricius in vol. 5. of Bibl. Gr. See a Menologia in p. 64. of the same Dissertation. See Eman. Phile de Animalibus, from p. 697 to p. 709. and his ἐπιγράμματα, from p. 710 to p. 715. See also the verses of Joannis Geometræ, p. 716. and Joannis Mauropi, p. 718 to p. 722. vol. vii. See Jenesius, p. 622. vol. vi. and Heliodori Carmen de Chrysopoeia, p. 790 to p. 797. We really do not mean to make any ostentatious parade of references, or quotations; but we were anxious to impress very strongly upon the minds of our readers that property of the iambic verse, which, amidst so many and so gross corruptions of it in other respects, was still preserved in the point which Dawes had the merit of reducing to rule. He would not have been displeased to find, that his own remark upon the Attic writers of the Drama was capable of being extended to so many λαμβόγραφοι in other kinds of poetry.

Admiscuerunt, impari tamen loco.
Pedemque primum, tertium, quintum quoque
Junxere paulo Syllabis majoribus.
At qui cothurnis regios actus levant,
Ut sermo Pompæ regiæ capax foret:
Magis magisque latioribus sonis
Pedes frequentant, lege servata tamen.
Dum pes secundus, quartus, et novissimus,
Semper dicatus uni Iambo serviat:
Nam nullus alius ponitur, tantum solet
Temporibus æquus non repelli Tribrachys.

Ovid, indeed, calls the Iambic celer in contradistinction to the scazon. But Horace uses citus of the pure Iambic verse, as distinguished from the more slow verses, which the tragic writers adopted, and into which spondees were admitted in the 1st, 3d, and 5th places. It is somewhat remarkable, that, according to the schema trimetrorum Senecæ, drawn up by Avantius, the iambic in the fifth place occurs only nine times, and the tribrach thrice. The spondee, generally, and sometimes an anapæst, are used in that part of the verse. By an error, we suppose, of the press, a dactyl is put in the Metrical Table, for the anapæst.

Mr. W. p. 124. of the Geor. corrects a word in line 113. 6th Sat. B. 1.

Fallacem circum vespertinumque pererro
Sæpe forum.

See Mattaire, Corp. Poet. vol II. p. 1261.

For vespertinum he reads vespertinus: we think this correction far more probable than that of Markland, on the 16th Epode, where he proposes vespertinum for vespertinus, and quotes the very line which Wakefield here would alter. As to the position of que, no objection can be drawn from it against Mr. W.; for Horace writes,

Ore pedes tetigitque crura.
Moribus hic meliorque fama.

—— parvi me quodque pusilli
Finxerunt animi ——

To the learned reader no apology is necessary for the introduction of the conjectures which we have found in Mr. Wakefield's third part of the Silva Critica, and in his edition of the Georgics. Dr. C. does not profess to have consulted them, and therefore he is not to be blamed for omitting what is contained in them. But the good wishes we have for the Var. Ed. induce us to say that we should have been happy to find this labour anticipated.

The Georgics were published in 1788, and of course the observations contained in them might have been somewhere inserted in the Var. edit. The third part of the Silva Critica appeared in 1792, and as the Var. edit. was then far advanced, Dr. C. might have thrown together Mr. W.'s conjectures at the end of his edition, which came out in the winter of 1793.

Dr. C. does not mention in his catalogue the conjectures upon Horace, which are to be found in Mr. Markland's edition of the Silvæ of Statius. But in conformity to our principle of bringing forward supplemental matter to the Variorum edition, we shall lay before our readers the substance of what Mr. Markland has written about Horace, in the work above mentioned.

B. iii. Od. xxiii. v. 7. —— aut dulces alumni
Pomifero grave tempus anno.

Markland, in his Statius, p. 35, reads, pomiferi anni. Tempus pomiferi anni, says he, ut tem-

pus teneri anni seu veris, apud Martialem, Epig. xiv. l. 19. de Earino.

Nomen habes teneri quod tempora nuncupat anni.

Epod. i. v. 29. Nec ut superni villa candens Tusculi.

M. prefers in p. 50. *superbi* to superni.

Epist. i. Lib. ii. v. 207.
Lana Tarentino violas imitata veneno.

M. p. 101. would read Læna, *shortly adding*, that he had made the same emendations, p. 87. of the Epist. Crit. This epistle was published at Cambridge, 1723, and the Statius in London, 1728. It is always of importance to mark the interval between the different appearances of the same criticism, for we ought to presume, that a critic, after reconsideration, acquiesces in his first opinion.

Lib. i. Od. 31. v. 3. —— non opimas
Sardiniæ segetes feracis.

The common reading is opimæ, and so we find it in Cuningham, Bentley, Torrentius, and Lambin. Mr. M. p. 225. in his Statius, would read opimas, and so it is printed in Gesner, the Delphin edition, and the Variorum.

Ars Poet. v. 40. —— cui lecta potenter erit res.

Markland, p. 232, would read pudenter, and this reading is, in the Variorum, produced from a note of Bishop Hurd, who introduces it from the learned editor of Statius. The Bishop says, a similar passage in the Epistle to Augustus adds some weight to this conjecture.

—— Nec meus audet
Rem tentare pudor, quam vires ferre recusent.

But in justice to Mr. Markland, we must add, that he has himself quoted this very passage, and

yet the words of the Bishop might lead his readers to suppose, that they were indebted to *him* only for the quotation. We do not mean to insinuate that the Bishop intended to misguide us. We observe by the way, Dr. Combe, in *translating* the words of the Bishop, seems to have made an unnecessary and incorrect addition. The Bishop says plainly, "the learned Editor* of Statius:" but the Variorum Editor says, "Editor doctissimus *Papilii* Statii." With submission to the Doctor, we remembered, and we have since found, that Markland, Veenhusen, and Cruquius, write Papinius, not Papilius; and we would remark, that our poet, invested with the triple dignity of names, was called Publius *Papinius* Statius. In Gruter's inscriptions we find Papinius and Papirius, but not Papilius. Again, in the Tabulæ Coss. and Triumph of Verrius Flaccus, we find Popilius, and Papirius, but not Papilius.

Lib. ii. Od. iv. v. 13. —— Nescias an te generum beati.

Markland, p. 247. would read, quî scis an te, &c. and quotes from the Ars Poet. 462. Quî scis an prudens.

* We quote from the Cambridge edition of 1757, but we believe that a more enlarged edition has since been published, in which, however, it is not very probable that the Bishop has inserted the word Papilius. We wish Dr. C. had told his readers the particular work of Statius, for though the Bishop mentions it not, yet in p. 460. vol. i. of the Variorum, we have a note, wherein Klotzius expressly speaks of Markland as confirming, in p. 192 of his notes ad Statii Silvam. lib. iv. i. the opinion which Klotzius holds about Dux bone, lib. iv. Od. 5. v. 37. where he defends Dux in opposition to Bentley, who would read Rex, and adds, that Dux is not confined to the signification of military glory; referring for the justness of this remark to Horace, lib. iii. Od. xiv. v. 7. and to the note of Markland above mentioned.

Epist. i. B. ii. v. 110. Fronde comas vincti cœnant.

Markland, p. 247. would read certant, quia Horatius hic agit de studio scribendi: sed quid ad rem utrum cœnent vel non cœnent?

Od. xv. B. i. v. 35. Post certas hyemes.

M. in p. 247. would read denas for certas.

Sat. iii. B. ii. v. 234. In nive Lucana dormis ocreatus.

M. in p. 248. would read duras for dormis. He prints tu for in before nive, and so does Cuningham in his text, but with this note, "Tu nive," ita citat. H. Johnson, ad Gratium, p. 20. et ita R. B. In nive MSS. edd.

We have now laid before our readers a series of emendations, many of which we should have been more happy to see in the Variorum edition, than to insert in our Review; and if any excuse be required for the length of this article, we shall find one in the spirit of Markland's words, Leve est quod dicturus sum, nisi quòd ad Horatium pertinet; et ideo non est leve. Markland's Epist. Crit. p. 164.

At the close of this critique, we return to the Var. Editor. In the catalogue, he says, Lævinii Torrentii edit. Horatii, 4to. 1608. But it would have been useful to add, cum Commentario Petri Nannii Alcmariani in Hor. de Art. Poet. Nannius is first introduced by Dr. C. to his readers in a note upon line 34. de Art. Poet. and he is quoted in the same work of Horace on no less than thirty passages. We must therefore state, what Dr. C. ought to have explained for the information of such persons as may purchase the Variorum, but are not in possession of Torrentius's edition. The notes of

Torrentius are not continued beyond the second epistle of the second book. But the commentary of Nannius is subjoined to Horace de Art. Poet. and begins p. 783. of Torrentius's edition. See Fabricii Bib. Lat. vol. i. p. 254. and Harles's Introduct. ad Notit. Lig. Rom. part ii. page 384.

The purchasers of a Variorum edition may in several respects be compared to jurymen, who are supposed only to know what the occasion immediately brings before them; and the writer of the preface to such an edition seems to resemble a judge, whose office it is to hold up every striking circumstance of the case, to exhibit a clear view of its general merits, and to assist those to whom he addresses himself, in forming correct conceptions, and passing an impartial sentence. But lest we should ourselves be likened to Lord Biron, and "proclaimed for men full of comparisons and wounding flouts," we will not press these resemblances any further. Reasonable, however, we do call it, that he, who selects notes from various critics, who, with various degrees of talent, and for various purposes of illustration, have endeavoured to explain the same ancient author, should be expected to favour his readers with some intimation of his own opinions upon their comparative excellencies, to give a short representation of the character, by which they are severally distinguished; to unfold, now and then, the order of their succession to each other; to touch upon circumstances, if there be any, of literary or personal hostility, and perspicuously, if not

copiously, to lay open the principles of selection, which may have prevailed through his own work. There is a medium between conciseness and prolixity, which men of sense are at no loss to preserve; and he, who from false delicacy, or conscious incapacity, says too little, sometimes multiplies those difficulties, which, in point of fact, are removed by him, who says too much, whether he be impelled by motives of petty ostentation or superfluous solicitude.

General celebrity excites general curiosity, and by exciting it, makes the explanation, of which we are speaking, more necessary. What is distinctly known by an editor, may be known very imperfectly by many readers, and before they can determine with propriety upon the execution of the work, they must enter fully into the views of the person by whom it is conducted. They must see the reasons which operated upon his mind in the different structure of different parts, and then, by examining them both separately and collectively, they will understand the whole with precision, and with justice will approve of the correspondence between profession and performance, between that which raises expectation and that which gratifies it, between general rules and their particular application.

It is the custom of scholars, and perhaps the duty of reviewers, to compare the materials of a Variorum edition, with the contents of those learned works, from which they are extracted. But such toil ought not to be imposed upon the general classes of readers; and indeed one great and characteristic use

of such an edition is, to supersede the necessity of laborious and complicated inquiry, to collect what was before scattered, and to throw within the reach of many, that information which in the ordinary course of things is accessible only to few. The superficial and the learned are alike expected to read it, and the same explanations which add to the knowledge of the one, tend at the same time to guide the decisions of the other.

We admit without reluctance, and without reserve, the discretionary right of an editor to reject one critic, and employ another; to use the works of the same critic more or less; to dismiss and recal him at will, or at will to retain him in perpetual service. But there are cases where we may also insist upon the right of a reader to be informed of the causes which have produced such preference, and we conceive, that in stating such causes, an editor would meet with many valuable opportunities for showing the justness of his choice, the delicacy of his taste, and the adaptation of his *previous researches* to his immediate design. They who deny this right, are governed by rules which are to us totally unknown; and they who contend for it, will have on their side the general wishes of those who read, and the general practice of those who write. As to the exceptions which might be adduced, and of which we are ourselves well aware, they are not very formidable, either from number or authority; and the plea which they furnish may easily be invalidated, by the examples of Grævius, of Gronovius, and other illustrious scholars, whose charac-

ters the learned world has long contemplated with reverence; and whose works have spread before inferior writers such models of regularity, as may be understood without difficulty, and imitated with advantage.

Of the critics, whose observations are admitted into the Variorum edition of Horace, many stand in the highest class of literary eminence; and upon the whole, we are convinced that they who have written most ably, appear most frequently. But in order to secure the assent of our readers to this general position, and at the same time to preserve that accuracy which, in justice to the editor, and to the public, we have attempted in every part of our observations upon this splendid work, we must descend to a more particular statement.

In the former part of our Review, which was chiefly employed on the catalogue, we took the liberty of remarking, that one conjecture of Bishop Hare, one explanation by Dr. Taylor, and one emendation by Taylor's friend, are omitted in the second volume of the Var. edit.; that in neither volume can be found the contents of Wakefield's Silva Critica, Parts I. and II. nor of Markland's Epistola Critica; that from the Epodes, to the end of Horace's work De Arte Poetica, the Observations published by Markland, at the end of the Ἱκετίδες, are by mistake ascribed to the very learned Mr. Bowyer; and that from Waddelus, who in thirty-one places might have furnished interpretations, or conjectural readings, for the second volume, only one emendation is produced, videlicet, on verse 112 of the 18th Epist. lib.

1. Now we leave it with our readers to decide on the comparative merits of the criticisms which are, and of those which are not, inserted from Waddelus. But we are confident that they will not blame our fidelity, in vindicating Markland's claims to Markland's observations; and we trust, that they will be disposed to praise our industry, in communicating from Hare, Taylor, Wakefield,* and Markland, those materials, which it would have given us great pleasure to see in the Variorum edition, and which, from their intrinsic worth, are intitled to the notice of scholars.

After careful inquiry, we are compelled to acknowledge that the fate of several other critics is not only various, but to us, more than once inexplicable. Some, like the ἄγγελοι, or the ἐξάγγελοι, in the ancient drama, come forward, tell their tale, depart, and return no more. Others, like the leading Dramatis Personæ, appear and disappear, as occasion may seem to require. A third class, like the chorus, when they have once taken their station, preserve it to the close. Something like this, in an uncommon manner, and to a degree uncommon, may be done with the distinct knowledge and deliberate choice of an editor. But wheresoever it *is* done, we could wish to have been previously in-

* Knowing that Mr. W. does not use accents in his Silva Critica, in his Translation of St. Matthew, and many other of his learned writings, we, in our Review for February, excepted him from those who used them. But, on consulting his Observations, we find accents used there, though not in any passage quoted by the correctors of the Var. Edit. of Horace.

formed of peculiarities, which, however irregular in appearance, *may* in reality be quite judicious.

The names of Desprez, Sanadon, Dacier, Muretus, Bond, and Pulman, *as subjoined to their respective notes*, do not occur again after a few first odes of the first book. Barnes's Homer is quoted once on the second Ode of the same book, and no more. The notes of Rutgersius do not appear beyond the same book. Zeunius is for the first time introduced in the first Ode of the second book, and is used, more or less, to the conclusion of the second volume. The notes of Lambin, Cruquius, and Torrentius, are employed in the first and second books of the Odes. No traces are to be found of them in the third book. But in the fourth, they re-appear, and do not again vanish in the succeeding parts of Horace. Baxter, Gesner, Cuningham, and Bentley, are happily found through the whole work. The same, probably, may be said of Linnæus, from whom we learn, among other particulars, that palma, the third text word in the second line of page 2, vol. i. means Phœnix Dactylifera; and that hirudo, the last text word, in the last line of the last page of vol. ii. means Hirudo Medicinalis. The Venusinæ Lectiones of Klotzius are very properly employed through the Odes, and, so far as they could be, in other parts of Horace. From Janus copious extracts are made through the four first books of the Odes, and his edition, it is well known, extends no further. Markland's conjectures, subjoined to the quarto edition of the Supplices Mulieres, and Wakefield's Observations, published in 1776, are

PRÆFATIO.

Tres, qui hoc volumine continentur, libri a Bellendeno conscripti, vel inter rarissimos jam olim numerati sunt. Quod autem effecimus, ut excitati e tenebris Bibliothecarum publici juris nec-opinato fierent, magisque quam antea parabiles, fore compertum habemus ob nostram hancce σπουδὴν, ut gratiam cum eruditis omnibus haud mediocrem ineamus.

De scriptore ipso, deque ordine, quo hæc opuscula ediderit, paucula rejecimus ad calcem hujusce Præfationis; quæ tamen veremur ut iis satisfaciant, qui intelligentiam ponant in legendi quodam fastidio. Sibi interea, velimus, sic persuaderi sinant, sylvam satis amplam errorum, qui in editionem priorem irrepsissent, e nostræ et textu et margine sublatam esse: loca fere omnia, ad quæ colligenda animum intendisset Bellendenus, diligenter a nobis inspecta: in eo denique nostram operam sedulo navatam, ut editio hæc prodiret, tum accurata maxime, tum etiam ad nitoris laudem, quoad ejus fieri posset, instructa et composita.

Aliud esse opus a Bellendeno inchoatum affectumque, cui titulus sit "De tribus luminibus Romanorum," quotus est quisque vir mediocriter doctus, qui fando non acceperit? illud etiam qui viderit,

atque adeo visum, sua ut abderet in κειμήλια, avidissime arripuerit, potest certe reperiri unus et alter ex iis, quibus libri sint in deliciis rari, suoque in genere exquisiti. Operis ejus quidem illa in parte, quæ ad manus nostras pervenit, de Cicerone agitur solo; idque, non modo incorrupta Latini sermonis integritate, verum etiam singulis pene verbis, puris putis, ut aiunt, Ciceronianis. Talis autem vir tantusque cum agmen duceret, magna esse debebat hominum expectatio de reliquis duobus, quos Ciceroni, quasi ejus imitatores quosdam studiorum et socios famæ, Bellendenus adjungere instituisset. Verum enimvero illi quinam fuerint, diu multumque a nobis quæsitum est, sed frustra tamen. Tandem aliquando in viros quosdam incidimus rei litterariæ peritissimos, qui certiores nos facerent voluisse nostrum, de Seneca et Plinio majore justum librum conficere. Colligimus autem ex operis ipsius ratione, fuisse eum e Scriptoribus, quos sibi sive ad laudandum sive ad imitandum proposuisset, copiam verborum suos in usus comparaturum. Egregium hoc consilium, quo minus ex sententia ejus cederet, in causa fuit mors Scriptoris; ipsa illa quidem haud immatura, doctis eadem bonisque omnibus nunquam non deflenda. Ut studiorum, ad quæ diu ille feliciterque incubuisset, fructos uberrimos nosmetipsi perciperemus, id sane fortuna nobis invidit. Est autem cum Bellendeno actum præclare, siquidem morte a Deo Opt. Max. donatus non bello viderit ardentem Britanniam, non flagrantes invidia regni Proceres, non Ecclesiam funditus eversam, non civium optimorum internecionem,

non sceleratissimum Regis parricidium, non denique ægram et prope depositam eam civitatem, in qua, Henricum ille suum olim voluisset regiis omnibus virtutibus instruere atque ornare.

Insedit profecto et pene inveteravit in animis eruditorum hæc opinio, Middletonum, cum de Ciceronis vita opus scriberet, Bellendeni hisce e fontibus irrigasse hortulos suos. Ferunt etiam illum de industria, quo furtum suum melius celaret, nomen Bellendeni silentio jam tum prætermisisse, cum varios, qui sibi aliquid adjumenti suppeditassent, Scriptores, suo quemque ordine, recensere profiteretur. His ego rumusculis, cum in Middletono laudando solerem multus esse, inter audiendum subirascebar. Ita enim semper animum induxi, ut de tanto viro caute et modeste pronuntiandum esse statuerim. Præterea, haud nescius eram, quam acris esse soleat doctorum invidia, quam sint avidæ et capaces auriculæ indoctorum, quam firma ad memoriam rerum levissimarum, et in calumniis propagandis veteratoria sint vapparum et nebulonum ingenia. Famam quippe videram incendere etiam convicia non credentium, quoties certamen factum esset inquinandi laudes eorum, qui artes infra se positas existimarentur prægravare. Causas igitur hujusce, quæ de Middletono incidisset, suspicionis sæpenumero sum et acerrime perscrutatus; semperque sensi aquam hærere etiam illis, inter quos odium nominis Middletoniani glisceret vehementissime. Ita profecto Caium suspicatum esse suspicabatur Titius. Ita se multis ante annis, aut legisse nescio quo libro, aut voces, ut fit, eruditorum sub-

auscultando excepisse Sempronius credebat. Bellendeni vero librum qui vidissent, perpaucos reperi: qui eum contulisset cum Middletoni opere, (Wartonum si excipias) plane neminem. Hac autem a me diligentissime facta collatione, res illico omnis ad liquidum perducta est.

Litteræ fuerunt Middletono, non vulgares hæ et quotidianæ, sed uberrimæ et maxime exquisitæ. Fuit judicium subtile limatumque. Teretes et religiosæ fuerunt aures. Stylus est ejus ita purus ac suavis, ita sine salebris ullis profluens quiddam et canorum habet, numeros ut videatur complecti, quales in alio quopiam, præter Addisonum, frustra quæsiveris. Animum fuisse ejusdem parum candidum ac sincerum, id vero, fateor invitus, dolens, coactus.

Equidem de fide hominis in rebus sacris fastidiosius et acerbius loqui nolim. Permoleste autem fero, potuisse eum, qui ingenii tam acris elegantisque esset, laudibus Bellendenum meritis ac debitis privare. Fidentissime enim confirmaverim, Middletonum non modo ex Bellendeni opere supellectilem sibi sublegisse satis lautam atque amplam, sed libri ipsius prope formam, qua res ferret, adumbrasse. Cum in media Cantabrigiæ luce viveret, suique operis instrumenta undique colligeret, ad manum habebat Bibliothecas Cantabrigienses, libris eas quidem plurimis et exquisitissimis refertas. Qui autem "Academicæ Bibliothecæ ordinandæ methodum quandam proposuisset,"* ei, pene dixerim,

* Opera Middleton. tom. iv.

in propatulo erant scripta fere omnia Bellendeni. Quin Bellendeni ad hoc ipsum opus, etsi obscura sint omnia et occulta, respexisse illum tamen in Præfatione sua haud negaverim: in iis præsertim quæ dixerit de "temporum eorum Historia, quam contexere esset cuivis integrum, qui Ciceronis Epistolas diligenter evolvisset:" de tædio, quod in Cicerone bis terque legendo, ipse, si Diis placet, solus devorasset: de cura, quam in condendo et componendo, quæ posset mox depromere, animo ad commentandum et corrigendum prorsus obstinato, impendisset: de verbis ipsissimis Ciceronis, quæ auctoritatem secum afferrent maximam, apteque posita in Orationis serie plurimum haberent venustatis. Nimirum, quod Middletonus paulo ambitiosius prædicat, sese et velle facere et debere, illud ipsum est summa fide summaque arte a Bellendeno factum, jam inde ab ultimo principio operis, usque ad paginam extremam.

Estat Stephani Forcatuli "De raptu animorum" Dialogus festivissimus, in quo "alienæ inventionis prædones reprehendit." Scripsit etiam Thomasius de Plagiis Litterariis librum, cui, ut Morhofio * visum est, multa adjungi possunt. Horum utrumque librorum, prelo si quis denuo subjecerit, Middletono inuri eadem infamia debebit, quæ Salmasio, quæ Lipsio, quæ Wouwerio, aliisque Plagiariis ingenio et doctrina eximiis, haud immerito inusta est. At manes ejus, qui famæ Ciceronianæ custodem se adjutoremque egregium præstiterit, liceat mihi, verbis

* Morhof. Polyhistor. lib. i. cap. 5.

ex ipso Cicerone* depromtis, extremum alloqui. "Satis hæc multa" de Middletono: "ac sine odio omnia, nihil sine dolore."

Quod ad tres hosce libellos attinet, multis profecto nominibus dignos illos judicavimus, qui in conspectum hominum proferrentur; neque enim dubitandum est, quin ii se possint cordatiori cuique satis probare, non modo rerum ipsarum, quæ tractantur, gravitate; sed argumentorum lucido ordine, et luminibus sententiarum, et sermonis varietate atque elegantia plane admirabili.

In primo, res multas et varias ab ultima antiquitate repetivit Bellendenus, situque eas informi obrutas atque oppressas, in lucem protulit. Materiem illam de Persarum et Ægyptiorum disciplinis, rudem latissimeque sparsam collegit undique, et quodammodo coagmentavit in unum, et acumine styli diligenter limavit. Civitatum ortus et incrementa, quæ fuerit cuique peculiaris forma, quantum aliæ ab aliis discreparint, luculentissime descripsit. Quas in historia mendax Græcia excogitaverat fabellas, diluit refellitque. Philosophiæ, cum diliruntis redarguit commenta, tum sanioris illius quæ Pietati famulabatur, placita enodavit. Quæ quidem omnia eò pertinebant, ut religionis revelatæ veritatem solidis gravibusque argumentis Bellendenus confirmaret. Qui autem res hasce e ruderibus vetustatis eruit, is neutiquam antiquarii partes agit frigide et jejune: neque divertitur ad spinosas illas et exiles quæstiunculas, quibus in explicandis, est

* Philipp. ii. p. 521, edit. Grut.

ubi Theologi male feriati* torquent se miserrime, atque operam frustra conterunt. Stylus est Bellendeni, per librum huncce, dilucidus in primis, neque exquisitus nimis. Sententiæ hic illic occurrunt reconditæ, quibus adhibita, tanquam obrussa,† est ratio. Operis porro totius ita sunt aptæ inter se colligatæque partes, nihil ut sit asperum, vel hiulcum, vel dissolutum; nihil in alienum irruerit locum; nihil non positum sit in suo.

Ostendit in secundo, aliis qui præesse velit, illum ipsum quam potentem esse deceat sui; quam memorem servantemque rerum omnium quæ a legibus imperentur; quam audientem dictis sapientissimi cujusque; corruptelarum ab illecebris quam alienum; a blanditiis adulatorum quam abhorrentem; quam dignitate sua, tum in retinenda constantem, tum in augenda cautum et moderatum; quanta denique innocentia et in rebus omnibus temperantia, ut ab alienis videatur manus, oculos mentemque ipsam abstinere.

Senatoris quod sit officium, quibus potissimum fundamentis innitatur illa θρυλλουμένη populi salus, quam sacrosancta habenda sint omnia, quæ fiant ex institutis et more majorum, in tertio docet Bellendenus: et quidem ita docet, difficile ut sit dictu, utrum res verbis magis, an verba sententiis illustrentur.

De tribis illis Luminibus Anglorum, quibus hæcce editio dicatur, religioni nobis non habendum est, perhonorifice et sentire, et fari. Horum in

---

* Aul. Gell. lib. x. cap. 22. † Cic. Brutus, p. 150.

uno virorum, insigne utriusque fortunæ exemplum* vidimus. Cujus enim dicentis ex ore Senatus quondam pendebat, illius jam oratio, etsi nivibus hybernis simillima est, sibi tamen audientiam vix ullam facit. Indignitas rei hujusce et atrocitas, quanta sit, cum considero, sæpe illud animo recursat, quod de Druso est a Paterculo† scriptum pulcherrime. "In iis ipsis quæ pro Senatu moliebatur, Senatum habuit adversarium. Denique ea fortuna Drusi fuit, ut malefacta" adversariorum, "quam ejus optime ab ipso cogitata, Senatus probaret magis; et honorem, qui ab eo deferebatur, sperneret; injurias, quæ ab aliis intendebantur, æquo animo reciperet; et hujus summæ gloriæ invideret, illorum modicam ferret."

Architectum quendam verborum esse scio, qui a vulgo numeretur inter optimos oratores, propter expeditam ac profluentem quodammodo celeritatem, et‡ Commissiones meras. Fremant ejus fautores licet, dicam de Burkii eloquentia, quod sentio. Hujus suavitate maxime hilaratæ essent doctrinarum omnium illæ inventrices Athenæ: hujus maxime admiratæ ubertatem et copiam: hujus in labris Suadam§ sessitantem maxime veneratæ.

Fuerunt inter Romanos, qui|| siccitatem et inopiam, dummodo esset polita, dum urbana, dum elegans, in Attico genere ponerent, orationemque amplam, copiosam, excelsam, magnificam plane

---

* Liv. lib. xxviii. cap. 42. edit. Var. † Lib. ii. cap. 13.
‡ Suet. l. iv. c. 53. § Cic. Brut. p. 140.
|| Brut. p. 152. et de opt. gen. Or. p. 183.

contemnerent. Qui autem se credebant eruditas habere aures, intelligensque judicium, illi ipsi et gradus, et dissimilitudines, et varietatem Atticorum ignorabant. Marcum tamen Ciceronem* incessere audebant, ut tumidum, Asianumque, et redundantem. Nostra etiam in ætate non desunt, qui eandem de Burkio nobis insusurraverint insulsam, et frigidam cantilenam. Sed melius de hoc nomine sentiant, qui Atticos se volunt esse, cum clariorem vim eloquentiæ ferre non possint. Burkium si quis imitetur, eum credant et Attice dicturum, et optime. In litteris ipsi se sciant plurimum profecisse, quibus Burkius valde placuerit.

Illud etiam addo, vehementerque ad rem pertinere arbitror, Burkium, quicquid ageret, et quocunque se animo et cogitatione flecteret, maximarum semper videri rerum scientiam consecutum esse, deque artibus fere omnibus, quæ cum humanitate conjunctæ sint, optime et pulcherrime scripsisse. Sunt tamen, qui eloquentiæ rationes ab elegantia doctrinæ segregandas† putent, et in quodam ingenii atque exercitationis genere ponendas. Gratulemur illis quidem, sine litteris et sine disciplina disertis. Verum enim in Burkio, cum admirabilis quædam ad dicendum natura elucet, tum ratio inest bonis artibus instituta, multisque curis ac vigiliis elaborata. Græcæ nimirum linguæ Latinæque sermonibus animum is suum penitus imbutum esse idcirco voluit, quod ii ornamenta propria et quasi

* Quintil. lib. xii. cap. 12. † De Orat. lib. i. p. 88.

legitima Oratoris potissimum suppeditant, et consuetudinem similiter Anglice dicendi sensim afferunt.

Lectitavisse Platonem,* atque etiam audivisse dicitur Demosthenes, quod quidem gravissimus Auctor Marcus Cicero contendit ex genere et granditate verborum apparere. Burkius autem, quam sit plane perfecteque eruditus, quot Poetas noverit, quot Oratorum scripta sit illa divina memoria complexus, liquido patet ejus ex orationibus, in quibus unctius quoddam,† et litteratius dicendi genus esse doctissimus quisque senserit. Ingenium profecto illius admodum adolescentis, sicut Phidiæ ‡ signum, simul aspectum et probatum est. Quoniam vero multos intelligebat de facultate et gloria tantum detraxisse, quantum imminuissent industriæ, summum illud suum studium nunquam remisit, et summo labore superavit sui satietatem.

In dicendo quid rectum sit, paucorum est via et arte intelligere. Qualis autem ipse Orator sit, ex eo, quod effecit, facile quivis judicare poterit. Quare ad ea respiciamus, de quibus, antequam in hanc Senatus noctem incidimus, eadem semper fuit populi acerrimorumque æstimatorum sententia. Nemo igitur, inter viros, vel eruditos, vel disertos, inveniri potest, qui diligentius quam Burkius, litterarum scientiæ se dederit—nemo qui philosophiam illam matrem omnium bene factorum, beneque dictorum, coluerit exquisitius, nemo qui exercitationem mentis a studiis, quæ reconditis in artibus versantur, faciliùs transtulerit ad causas populares—nemo

---

* Brutus, p. 143. † Ib. p. 140. ‡ Ib. p. 149.

qui rerum, et veterum et recentiorum memoriam vel arctius vel copiosius tenuerit—nemo qui delectandi gratia jucundius sit a proposito parumper egressus, et a severitate ad risum lenius deduxerit animos audientium—nemo qui ad fletum eosdem, si res postularet, atque ad misericordiam vehementius deflexerit—nemo denique qui aut omni lepore et urbanitate conditior fuerit, aut magnificentia et splendore elatior. Hæc cui contingant, eum iterum ac sæpius dixerim Attice loqui, stylumque afferre, qui, cum suavitate sensus multitudinis perfundat, tum verborum cocinnitate et pondere sententiarum mentes doctorum attenteque audientium perfringat.

Peringeniosis neque satis doctis hominibus plerumque contingit, ut melius putent se dicere posse quam scribere, eaque de causa satis magnam se credant adeptos esse gloriam, etiamsi, quid in eloquentia profecerint, in arbitrium docti atque intelligentis existimatoris nunquam venerit. Magno etiam plausu sæpe excipiuntur orationes, quæ pervulgatæ mox, et in manibus jactatæ et excussæ frigent, atque, ut ita dicam, flaccescunt. Chatamus erat ille quidem fortis vir, animosusque et metuendus Orator, et verissimis politici hominis laudibus exornatus: sed dicendi lenociniis opinionem faciebat majorem, quàm quanta in eo erat facultas.* Eadem sane illi, quæ Cromwellio, ἀγχίνοια erat, ut pene ipsa oculorum contentione et conjectu perspiceret, quid ii, quibus persuadere aliquid vellet, aut cogitarent, aut sentirent, aut opinarentur, aut expectarent, aut exti-

* Brutus, p. 149.

mescerent. Cum hac autem facultate sagaciter pervestigandi consilia hominum intimosque sensus, alia quædam conjuncta sunt, quæ Cromwellio, quem accepimus, cum in senatu diceret, tardum in cogitando et instruendo dissipatum fuisse, minus contigerunt. Etenim in Chatamo inerat jam tum, cum ad dicendum ἀνόρουσε,* præproperum et fervidum ingenium, verborumque cursus quidam concitatior, et interdum sonitus, quo completæ adversariorum aures obsurduerunt. Ipso in homine quoque naturalem quandam auctoritatem fuisse memini, quæ et Orationi audientiam faceret, et Oratori fidem maximam conciliaret, et ab auditorum animis victis atque expugnatis, quas vellet sententias, extorqueret. Etsi ad docendum videtur, atque ad delectandum minus paratus fuisse, erat tamen lateribus pugnans, concitans † animos, sese jactans atque ostentans, vehemens, stomachosus, victoria denique ipsa ferocior impotentiorque. Sæpe erat in laudando gravis, sæpius in vituperando acer et acerbus, in altercando idem cum aculeo aliquo et maledicto nonnunquam facetus. At remove ista augustiora, quæ in nomine pene ipso Chatami continentur—tolle illud quod Demostheni videbatur in Oratore esse primum, secundum,‡ tertium, et quidem in Chatamo ad laudem, atque admirationem consequendam eminebat singulare, et prope incredibile—tolle dignitatem formæ—tolle vocis splendorem et magnitudinem—tolle corporis istos motus plenissimos semper artis, et interdum molestos, et ad Scenam potius quam

* Iliad, i. 248. † Brutus, p. 148. ‡ Orat. p. 158.

ad Senatum institutos—næ, in orationibus illis ipsis, quibus nihil unquam perfectius exstitisse, auditores aiebant, vix quidquam invenies, vel quod aurium sensum feriat suaviterve afficiat, vel quod ad intelligentium judicium argute et distincte expositum sit, vel denique quod lente et fastidiose æquus lector probaverit, aut poscere semel inspectum velit.

Chatami fateor tantam animi * magnitudinem fuisse, ut sibi omnia, quæ clarissimorum civium essent, vindicaret, et summa dignitate obtineret. Ad hanc egregiam et præclaram virtutis indolem, accessit quædam ad amplitudinem et gloriam et ad res magnas bene gerendas, divinitus adjuncta fortuna.† De munere porro quod sibi mandatum esset, ita magno "et elato animo, Scipionis ‡ instar, in Senatu disseruit, ut ardorem eum, qui resederat, excitaret rursus novaretque: et impleret homines certioris spei, quam quantam fides promissi humani, aut ratio ex fiducia rerum subjicere" vel "solet," vel in alio quopiam debuisset. At vero gravissime ii falluntur, a quibus Chatamus existimatur, non modo cum primis eloquens, sed tanquam germanus quidam Demosthenes. Erat ille Græcus ab omni laude felicior; nam eo, cum nunquam gravior quisquam exstitit, tum neque callidior neque temperantior.§ Qui autem in hoc solo se exercet, ut præceps ardensque et grandiloquus sit; qui nihil solet leniter, nihil explicate, nihil definite dicere, is stomacho plus dare quam consilio videtur, et prope abesse a

* Brutus, p. 151. † Orat. pro Leg. Man. p. 313.
‡ Liv. lib. xxvi. c. 19. § Orat. p. 156.

quadam orationis insania. Chatamus quicquid habuit, quantum fuit, illud fere totum habuit vel a natura, vel ab usu. Quamobrem, etsi volubilis atque incitatus in dicendo fuit, idem illi accidit, quod et Galbæ * acciderat, ut, cujus in verbis mens ardentior spirasset, ejus in scriptis omnis illa vis, et quasi flamma Oratoris extingueretur.

Jam vero in Burkio, ut ad illud, quod in dicendo summum esset, excurrere atque evolare videretur,† domesticus etiam labor ad Senatorium accessit. Quibus regionibus vitæ spatium est circumscriptum, iisdem eloquentiæ suæ commemorationem Burkius terminari noluit. Posterorum qui et sine odio, et sine gratia judicabunt, gravissimam illam de ingenio suo sententiam Burkius nequaquam aut extimuit, aut certe defugit.

Permultos esse scio, qui, cum stylum esse videant optimum dicendi effectorem et magistrum, maxima concinnitate, maximaque arte inter scribendum tractent omnia, iidemque ex umbraculis doctorum hominum in solem traducti, non modo præclare ab ipsis cogitata eloqui nequeant, sed inopes et prope hebetes videantur. Burkius autem, etsi persuasum habuit nihil magis ad loquendum proficere quam scriptionem, armis tamen est pariter ac palæstra institutus.‡ Quem vero non ingenii solum vis, sed etiam naturalis quidam impetus in dicendo inflammavit, eundem, cum otiosus stylum prehenderet, motus ille animi ardorque nunquam defecit. Quæ cum ita sint, quod de historia, quam ipse summo

* Brut. p. 141. † Id. p. 151. ‡ Id. p. 138.

labore confecisset, Thucydides* prædicavit, illud ipsum de orationibus suis merito Burkius prædicaverit—*κτῆμα ἐς ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν σύγκεισθαι.*

Hominum hic mos est, ut nolint eundem plurimis rebus excellere. Opera autem quæ Burkius edidit, varia et in suo quæque genere egregia, quis non legit summo cum fructu summaque voluptate? Verum de Oratore, qualis et quantus sit, jam non quærimus, sed de Critico, ac Philosopho.

Criticæ artis scientiam, ab aliis illam quidem exceptam, sed auctam per sese, plurimis et illustrioribus litteris Burkius explicavit; atque hac quidem in parte stylus est illius limatus facetusque, neque tamen nimia religione attenuatus. Jam quis ignorat Philosophorum sermonem plerumque contractiorem esse atque horridiorem, quam tritæ hominum aures patiantur? At grave illud virus sordesque, ut ita dicam, orationis, Burkius sua elegantia et munditia omnino pepulit, et rebus, quæ spinosiora omnia et exiliora quondam pepererant, iis nunc demum accommodavit fusius quoddam, et uberius, et splendidius explicandi genus. Qui autem tot præclara ipse scripsit, alios etiam, quemadmodum bene et ornate scribere possent, cum præceptis, tum exemplo docuit. Etenim sive orationes verbis sonantibus et exquisitis sententiis plenissimas concinnat, sive judicium illud suum acre et subtile ad artes componendas transfert, scripta sunt ejus omnino omnia hujus-

* Thucyd. p. 18, edit. Duker.

modi, ut legentium ingenia non solum acuere possint, verum etiam alere, atque informare.

In quo autem homine, cum illa, quæ jucunda et grata, tum etiam illa, quæ mirabilia sunt in virtute, elucent, ejus de moribus hoc solum dicere necesse habeo, semper innocentiam Burkii et integritatem singularem fuisse, vitæque rationem justissime ab aliis reposcere eum, qui reddere non reformidet suæ.

Intelligo quam in lubrico et difficili loco verser: neque enim defuturos esse arbitror, qui clamitent nos nostris verbis nimis hæc magna facere, quibus videamur etiam nimio quodam Burkii studio atque amore abripi, qui denique non erubescant conqueri, nos ea, quæ in Burkio prorsus non sint, impensius et verbosius collaudare. Atqui possunt de eo dici longe plura, et longe majora. Hæc etiam ipsa quæ a me vere dicta sunt, vellem quispiam alius vel uberius dixisset, vel pro rei magnitudine ornatius. Illud tamen considerate et constanter dico de iis, qui simul distincte et ornate dicendo, periteque scribendo scienterque, magni sunt aut fuerunt, neminem esse, qui vel ob ingenium, vel ob doctrinam, vel ob benevolentiam, vel ob pietatem, vel ob ullas viri sapientis et boni virtutes, Burkio anteponi debeat.

De uno eorum hominum, quorum est multis magnisque rebus spectata virtus, esto hoc non magis benevolentiæ meæ, quam judicii testimonium simplex ac sincerum.

Meliore in omnia mente et ingenio, quam fortuna, alter est usus; neque in omni ejus vita aliquid est ad laudem illustrius, quam quod gravissima ca-

lamitate non fractus est, summamque in rebus asperis retinuit dignitatem.

Atqui verissimum est illud quod a Cicerone dicitur, * minimis sæpe momentis, maximas inclinationes temporum fieri, cum in omni casu reipublicæ, tum in bello, et maxime civili, quod opinione plerumque et fama gubernatur.

Habet Northius a natura plurimum acuminis, quod etiam arte limavit. Habet cum gravitate mistos sales, tum facetos, qui in narrando aliquid venuste versantur, tum dicaces, quorum, in jaciendo mittendoque ridiculo, vis omnis perspecta est. Memoriam etiam habet, quæ commemoratione antiquitatis et exemplorum prolatione valet maxime. Per id scitum est quoque in orationibus ejus, quod ineptias hominum et stultitias patientia perquam amabili devorandas esse statuit, ita tamen ut tristitiam quorundam, et acerbitatem mirifica urbanitate sæpe perstringat.

Verbis utitur non illis quidem ornatis, sed tamen non abjectis. Rem quamque videt acute, diligenterque et enodate explicat. Inter cæteras ejus laudes hæc certe non minima est, eum non solùm, quod † opus sit, dicere, sed etiam quod non opus sit, non dicere: omnibus in rebus ‡ sentire quid sit satis: § malle desinere ne tædium creet, quam nimium loquendo deficere. Civilis autem scientiæ ratio sic Northio suppetit, ut ei vix ullam deesse virtutem viri politici existimem. His ad di-

---

* Phil. 5. pag. 154.
† Cic. Orator. pag. 169.
‡ De Orator. l. ii. pag. 119.
§ Quintil. lib. xii. cap. 11.

cendum instrumentis, quæ vel ab ingenio vel ab industria profecta sunt, summus accedit et prope singularis amor in patriam, cujus morem disciplinamque optime intelligit, et constantissime, quoties veniunt in disceptationem, defendit.

Animus hominis et mores quales sint, si quæris,* civis fuit jam tum, cum haberet famæ suæ parem, summa in dignitate modestissimus. Amicitiarum est apprime tenax: in offensis idem exorabilis: in reconcilianda gratia fidelissimus: potentia sua ad impotentiam usus nunquam: omnium denique vitiorum pene expers, nisi numeretur inter maxima, bellum Americanum spe lentius gessisse. Atqui bellum illud aliorum consiliis antea commotum et affectum, ægre ipsum et gravate suscepisse ferunt, cum ad arma uncta cruoribus nondum expiatis, ad arma eum cessantem, et Rex, et Senatus, et Populus certatim concitarent.

Causæ eorum, qui in honorum contentione versantur, sæpe possunt videri prope pares. Sæpe inter clarorum ac potentium virorum odia et discordias, aliquid est in utraque parte, quod boni cives probaverint. Sed cum rerum ipsarum incerti sint exitus, earumque fontes in profundo abditi, nihil me videre fateor, quod illas leniores privatæ vitæ et suaviores virtutes jure impediat—nihil, quod in officiis grati animi fungendis, anceps vel lubricum sit—nihil, quod debeat beneficiorum in quempiam collatorum, præsertim nulla unquam injuria interposita, memoriam penitus delere. Ecquidnam igitur, magis ut

* Vel. Pater. lib. ii. cap. 29.

vellem, accidere potuit, quam quod ea, quæ de Northii proditoribus* dixi, minus sunt probata? Equidem non magnopere studeo, quo hominibus placere possim, quorum præcordia, bene novi, inter legendum tacita culpa sudaverint. At mea in se moderatio et modestia, quæ et quanta sit, nunc demum a me ipso intelligant licebit.

Qui inter academiæ spatia et sylvas, quid verum et decens sit, quærere se profitentur, pacis, otii, tranquillitatis studiosi volunt videri; neque hanc ego laudem detrahere ausim multis et bonis, quos doctrinæ magis quam divitiarum cupidos esse, et in spernendis honoribus quam captandis fortiores cognoverim. Sed in subita illa, quæ in Northium eruperat, calamitate, serpsit mali contagio, et pene dixerim, invasit in hasce amœnas Musarum sedes, in hoc bonarum artium domicilium et quasi sacrarium, in hunc ipsum bonorum morum prope portum et perfugium.

Alii clam quidem mussitantes, vulgo tamen aiebant, indignum esse facinus, quod Northius diceret, se, quo temporibus reipublicæ et communi civium saluti inserviret, odium, quod inter se et Foxium exstitisset, ex animo velle deponere—alii contra gratiam ejus et dignitatem cæcas insidias tendebant—alii in ejusdem famam immanibus atque importunis conviciis invehebantur. At cujus viri? nempe ejus, quem satis comiter et benigne salutaverant, *τὸν οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ σωτῆρα καὶ εὐεργέτην αὐτῶν γεγενημένον.*† Quamobrem, teterrima horum facinora cum recor-

* Vid. Dedicat. ad Dom. North. † Lucian. in Timone.

dabar, sæpe meum animum gravis atque acerbus angebat dolor; sæpe illa incendebat liberrima indignatio, qua conficere potui, et fortasse debui, ut non solum in rem ipsam magna offensio, verum etiam odium in quosdam homines concitaretur, sane justum et debitum, omnium bonorum.

Vereor ne, hæc qui non viderint, omnia me nimis augere arbitrentur: quæ tamen ita esse, ut a me dicta sunt, liquido ipse non tam auritus quam oculatus testis confirmare ausim. Verum enimvero cum hisce desertoribus domini et regis sui, quam quidem potero leniter et remisse, agam. Quam magna cum libertate notabo rem, ea, quorsum pertineat, in medio relinquam. Neminem in tanta tamque fœda perfugarum colluvie, neminem, inquam, plane et diserte nominabo—quare nemo mecum, vel apertas inimicitias, vel obscuras simultates suscipere poterit, "nisi qui ante de se voluerit confiteri."

Quod ad Northium attinet, documentum is quidem grave et luctuosum dedit, quantulum optimis viris beneficiorum memoria prosit: quantum nocere iisdem possit levis et falsa opinio sceleris excogitati. Mentis vero in sanctis recessibus, habet quo se ex maximis molestiarum molibus recreet ac reficiat. Quoties enim secum reputat, sua ipsius quæ sit innocentia, quoties contumelias, quibus laceratus est, insignes et acerbas memoria repetit, quoties ad infidum respicit ingratumque optimatium gregem, quos opibus quondam honoribusque ipse auxit atque amplificavit, toties ejus ex pectore Lycurgeæ illæ erumpent voces, *ποῖός τις ὑμῖν δοκῶ εἶναι πολίτης, ὃς τοσοῦ-*

τῶν χρόνων, τὰ δημόσια πράττων παρ' ὑμῖν, δίδους μᾶλλον ἀδίκως, ἢ λαμβάνων εἴλημμαι.*

Animum habet tertius, cum magnum et excelsum, tum etiam simplicem et apertum, eminetque unus inter omnes in omni fere genere dicendi.

Sed quoniam oppressi sumus opinionibus non solum vulgi, verum etiam hominum leviter eruditorum; nostrum de stylo ejus judicium, quod tandem sit, paulo fusius jam, et accuratius explicabimus.

Multos vidi oratores,† quos in verbis ægre perpendendis coagmentandisque, sollicitudo infelix maceraret. Foxii autem animus varias in res continuas ita intenditur, ut eas tanquam provisas aptissimæ voces haud invite sequantur. Omnia is quidem novit verba esse alicubi optima. Itaque, quæ cultiore ‡ in parte viderentur sordida et humilia, ea nonnunquam in orationibus ejus suam quandam vim habent, et locum suum. At sunt in promtu, si res poscit, aut magis ornata, aut plus efficientia, aut melius et plenius sonantia. Exprimit quamque difficiliorem cogitationem quædam ἄλογος τριβή, § interque exprimendum expolit atque amplificat. Vivunt omnia moventurque. || Spiritu ipso ejus qui dicit, excitantur auditores, nec imagine solum et ambitu rerum, sed rebus ipsis novis et veluti nascentibus incenduntur. Plurimum igitur sanguinis nervorumque ejus in sermone esse, nemo est qui inficias eat. Aiunt autem nonnulli paulo morosiores

---

* Vid. Præf. Taylori ad Lycurg. et loc. laudat.

† Quint. l. xii. c. 10. ‡ Quint. l. x. c. 1.

§ Lib. x. c. 7. || Cap. 1.

abesse * illi, et quidem deesse plane atque omnino, stylum nitidum et lætum, qui omnes undique flosculos carpat et delibet. Sed meminerint ii, velim, judicio illum potius refugisse hasce dicendi delicias et ineptias, quam formidine ulla desperasse. Etenim, quæ attentum quemque, dum audiuntur, et docilem reddunt validæ aptissimæque sententiæ, illis sane ipsis, cum leguntur, suavitas † inest, non dulcis et decocta, sed, quæ a Cicerone merito laudatur, solida et austera.

Habet Foxius hoc etiam vere admirabile: quod salubritatem dictionis Anglicanæ et quasi sanitatem nunquam perdit, ut eos qui in calamistris adhibendis peregrinam quandam insolentiam consectantur, simplicitate prorsus inaffectata, et tanquam orationis sapore vernaculo obruat. Novit enim, qui non dicat quod intelligamus, eundem minus posse, quod admiremur, dicere. Novit etiam, quæ maximam utilitatem in se contineant, eadem in oratione habere plurimum vel dignitatis, vel sæpe etiam venustatis.

Jam vero eloquentiæ fulmina ‡ intelligit vibrari non posse, nisi numeris quibusdam contorqueantur. Hac de causa verborum perpetuitate, et conversione nonnunquam utitur, ut severos per illa ungues junctura effundat. Sæpe orationem carpit membris minutioribus, quæ tamen ipsa rhythmo quodam suo vinciuntur. Facile tamen in hac parte deprehendes negligentiam quandam haud ingratam, quæ homi-

* Cic. Brut. p. 152.
† De Or. l. iii. p. 129.
‡ Or. p. 169.

nem magis de judicii certamine, quam de ullo aucupio delectationis laborantem indicet—πολὺς μὲν ὁ τόνος, αὐτάρκης δ' ἡ χάρις.* Scilicet numeros illos minutos nunquam ita sequitur, ut sententias concidat delumbetque. Nunquam verba inferciens inania et canora, quasi rimas orationis explere studet. Otiosis ornamentis nunquam onerat delassatque aures, quarum est superbissimum judicium. Inde fit, ut neque diffluens sit aliquid et solutum, neque infractum, aut amputatum, aut hians. In conficiendo autem verborum orbe non aperte omnia, nec eodem modo semper, sed varie† dissimulanterque concluduntur.

Cum rerum ipsarum usus Foxius percalleat, regiones‡ videtur nosse omnes, intra quas venari quod quæratur, et pervestigare oporteat. Qua de re agitur autem illud, quod Juris-consultorum formulis et argutiis Dialecticorum includitur, tum quo valeat, tum ubi situm sit, prudentissime videt; semperque de eo ample disserit copioseque, aut distincte atque articulatim disputat. Quæ divulsa et dissipata sunt, ea omnia conglutinat, et ratione quadam constringit. Si quid involutum paulo-ve insolentius est, notitiam ejus aperit, non exiliter et jejune, aut ampullarum ope et sesquipedalium verborum, sed dilucide, expedite, et commune ad judicium popularemque intelligentiam accommodatissime.

Si in exordiis auditores primo movet leviter, reliqua illis jam inclinatis graviter incumbit acris et

---

* Dion. Hal Judic. Demosth. p. 171. edit. Sylburg.
† Br. p. 151. ‡ De Or. l. ii. p. 111.

contorta Oratio. Ipsæ porro prolusiones non ad speciem illæ quidem compositæ, ut Samnitum,* qui hastis ante pugnam vibratis nihil in pugnando utebantur; sed ejusmodi sunt, ut ei magno usui esse possint, cum ad victoriam acerrime nitatur. Res eum si qua premit vehementer, ita cedit, ut non modo non abjecto,† sed ne rejecto quidem scuto, fugiat; suoque in præsidio consistens, loci eligendi causa ἐντροπαλισάσθαι ‡ videatur. Ad refellendos autem adversarios tela confert omnia. Digitos modo comprimit, et aculeis Dialectices, quæ tanquam contracta et adstricta eloquentia putanda est, pungit homines in disputando perpugnaces: modo dilatat manus, et Orationis illius, quæ amplior magnificentiorque et splendidior est, omnes habenas effundit. Ingenii autem magnitudo ejus omnis fere elucet, cum ante occupat § quod opponi posse videat; cum sermones hominum moresque describit; cum exemplis utitur; cum denuntiat, quid adversarii caveant; cum fraudes civium ad perniciem, et integritatem ad salutem vocat; cum liberius quid audet; cum supplicat, optat, execratur.

Conciliantur vel maxime auditorum animi dignitate hominis, rebus gestis, vitæ denique existimatione; quæ quidem omnia, licet in adversario Foxii non meliora sint, facilius tamen ornatiusque, finguntur ut probus, ut bene moratus, ut bonus vir esse videatur. Sed quoquo modo se illud habet, Foxius est orator vere civilis, vereque sapiens. Non otiosis se dispu-

---

* De Or. l. ii. p. 110. † P. 119. ‡ Hom. Il. i. l. 546.
§ Orat. p. 163.

tationibus, sed Reipublicæ administrationi potissimum dedidit. Cum prius, quod honestum sit, in animo suo efficere constituit, omnibus, ad efficiendum quod proposuerit, naturæ dotibus, omnibus instrumentis artis, ex obnixe et decenter utitur. Hac de causa, quos audienti mihi motus adhibere voluit, ii semper in animo Oratoris impressi et inusti esse videbantur.

Dicendi, sicut reliquarum artium, fundamentum est sapientia.* Qui autem et a doctrina fuerit liberaliter instructus, et multo jam imbutus usu, ejus solet animus illuc rapi, ubi non aliqua seclusa Eloquentiæ aquula† tenetur, sed unde universum flumen erumpit. Ad res igitur humiles et tenuiores, quæ vel explanate vel subtiliter tractandæ sunt, Foxii ingenium nonnunquam summittitur. Decet‡ hoc nescio quomodo illum. Arripit, quotiescunque vult, medium illud dicendi genus. Gravitatis ad locos subito convertitur, ascenditque ad fortiora, et pervenit in summum.

Præceps et rapida ejus Oratio fit interdum, cum, idcirco obscura, quia peracuta est, tum, celeritate ipsa paululum cæcata.§ Sed neque verbis aptiorem cito aliam dixeris, neque sententiis crebriorem. Profecto maxima in rerum verborumque varietate, unus insidet tota in oratione quasi color quidam, et succus suus. Habet ea tamen veluti umbram|| aliquam et recessum, quo magis ea quæ illustriora sunt, eminere solent atque exstare. Summa est

---

* Or. p. 159. † De Or. l. ii. p. 111. ‡ Br. p. 153.
§ Br. p. 151. || De Or. l. iii. p. 128.

etiam in Foxio, perinde ac Demosthene, laus illa quod inter diversas et in omnem partem diffusas disputationes, versat* sæpe multis modis eandem et unam rem: quòd hæret in ea commoraturque: quod inculcat eam mentibus hominum atque infigit altissime.

Monendi sunt ii quorum de hac re sermo imperitus nimis increbruit, illud ipsum, quod in Foxio reprehendunt, esse artis vel intimæ et ingenii haud mediocris. Sæpe sunt illius sententiæ, si per se spectantur, graves, et exquisitæ, et ex abdito erutæ, ut videantur e Philosophorum spatiis potius, quam e Rhetorum officinis, profluxisse. Sæpe in propria ac definita disputatione hominum ac temporum versantur. Sæpe ad communem questionem universi generis traducuntur. Quo autem capiant te magis magisque, modo eas collocat in hoc lumine, modo in illo. Nimirum ad sensus voluntatesque diversas diversorum hominum inflectendas, orationis vim consulto accommodat. Quamobrem variis illam novisque insignibus distinguit; variis ex inexpectatis confirmat argumentis; varios trahit et repentinos in usus, ut animos etiam non faventium, aut commotos, in quam velit partem, alliciat, aut concitatos secum rapiat.

Quoniam vere, de Foxio, cæterisque, qui vel eum antecesserint ætate, vel ei suppares sint, comparatio quædam et contentio incidere potest, meam de ea re opinionem hisce summi Critici verbis totam complectar.

---

* Or. p. 162.

Τοιαύτην δὴ καταλαβὼν τὴν πολιτικὴν λέξιν, οὕτω κεκινημένην ποικίλως, καὶ τηλικούτοις ἐπεισελθὼν ἀνδράσιν, ἑνὸς οὐθενὸς ἠξίωσε γενέσθαι ζηλωτὴς, οὔτε χαρακτῆρος, οὔτε ἀνδρὸς· ἡμιέργους τινὰς ἅπαντας οἰόμενος εἶναι καὶ ἀτελεῖς· ἐξ ἁπάντων δ' αὐτῶν ὅσα κρατίστα καὶ χρησιμώτατα ἦν, ἐκλεγόμενος, συνύφαινε, καὶ μίαν ἐκ πολλῶν διάλεκτον ἀπετέλει, μεγαλοπρεπῆ, λιτήν· περιττὴν, ἀπέριττον· ἐξηλλαγμένην, συνήθη· πανηγυρικὴν, ἀληθινήν· αὐστερὰν, ἱλαράν· σύντονον, ἀνειμένην· ἡδεῖαν, πικράν· ἠθικὴν, παθητικήν· οὐδὲν διαλάττουσαν τοῦ μεμυθευμένου παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ποιηταῖς Πρωτέως.*

Dixi eam esse Foxio ingenii facultatem, quæ semper causis, in quas inciderit, parem se ostendat. Quoties autem illæ sunt dignæ in quibus latius se fundat, luminosas ad partes et quasi actuosas accedens, quicquid in dicendo potest, totum expromit. Quod quidem cum facit, veluti amnis monte decurrens saxa devolvit,† et pontem indignatur, et ripas se coërcentes undique diruit, copia atque impetu verborum. Hanc utique dicendi vim et celeritatem in Pericle olim mirabatur Eupolis: ad hanc obstupescunt auditores, qui Foxio acerbissime conviciantur.‡

Profecto indignissimam viri hujusce ad fortunam cum respicio, et præteritorum recordatio est acerba, et quidem acerbior expectatio reliquorum. Maxime is tamen laudandus est, qui in hoc communi civium integerrimorum et prope fatali malo

* Dion. Hal. Judic. de Demosth. p. 267.
† Quint. lib. xii. c. 10. ‡ Ibid.

consoletur se, cum conscientia mentis optimæ, tum, sanioris illius, quod de se posteritas latura sit, judicii expectatione.

Nunc de iis dicendum* est, quæ mihi conspiratione quadam vulgi reclamari intelligo. Qui enim reliquis in hominibus mites sunt, et cupiditates, quas Natura juvenibus profudit, faciles et tolerabiles habere solent; in hac fuerunt causa pertristes quidam patrui, censores, magistri.

Hi sunt eorum assidui et quotidiani sermones. "Si qui voluptatibus ducuntur, et se vitiorum illecebris dediderunt,† missos faciant honores: ne attingant rempublicam."

Quid igitur agam? quippe magna responsi invidia subeunda est, neque mitigari possunt legentium aures. Veniam igitur petere non ausim‡—perfugiis non utar juventutis aut temporum. Fatebor sane Foxium, cum in lubricas adolescentiæ vias ingrederetur, stuperetque jam in solitis et insanis fulgoribus, tanto mentis robore non fuisse, ut ei æqualium studia, ludique, et convivia displicuerint. Erupisse in eo fatebor, illum impetum animi ardoremque, qui, sive ad literas humaniores, sive ad prudentiam civilem, sive ad luxuriam amoresque inclinaret, id unum ageret,§ id toto pectore arriperet, id universum hauriret. Fatebor a vera illa et directa ratione non gradu eum aliquo, sed præcipiti cursu descivisse: ut patrimonium effuderit, ut fenore trucidatus sit, et naturale quoddam stirpis bonum de-

---

* Quint. l. xii. c. 1.
† Orat. pro Sext. p. 439.
‡ Or. pro Cæl. par. 5.
§ Dial. de Or. par. 28.

generaverit vitio ætatis. At hæ deliciæ quæ vocantur, etsi ad illas hæserit, nunquam eum occupatum impeditumque tenuerunt diu. At facultate jam florens, et studiis eloquentiæ per intervalla flagrans, cum blandimentis hisce conjunxit plurimum dignitatis. At scelere semper caruit. At in* Luxum se præcipitavit eum, qui a Tacito dicitur eruditus, itemque a Cicerone habetur homine ingenuo et libero† dignior. At revocavit se identidem ad curam reipublicæ. At‡ Petronii instar, vigentem se ostendit, et negotiis parem; effecitque, perinde ac§ Mutianus, ut, in quo nimiæ essent, cum vacaret, voluptates, in eo, quoties expediret, magnæ elucerent virtutes. At vixit, hodieque idem vivit, amicis carus. At dulcissimus illis semper occurrit, eò quod æqualitas et pares honorum gradus, et studiorum quasi finitima vicinitas, tantum absunt ab invidiæ obtrectatione, ut non modo non exulcerare eorum gratiam, sed conciliare videantur. At dignus est quem numeres inter multos et quidem bonos, qui, cum adolescentiam fere totam voluptatibus dedidissent, emerserint aliquando, probique homines et illustres exstiterint.

Dum in procuratione publicorum negotiorum versabatur, consilia sua omnia ita diligenter et animose instituit, ita fuit ad excogitandum quid e Republica esset, solers acerque, ita in muneribus, quæ susceperat, explendis alacer et promtus, ut ne

---

* Tacit. Annal. xvi. cap. 18.
† Orat. in L. Pis. par. 11.
‡ Tacit. Annal. xvi. cap. 18.
§ Hist. 1. cap. 10.

æmulis quidem aut adversariis pernegantibus, ostenderit sese

Μύθων τε ῥητῆρ' ἔμεναι, πρηκτῆρα τε ἔργων. *

Redite mecum, lectores in memoriam rerum, quas nuper vidimus, miserrimarum.

Cum jam prope esset, ut optabilem ex iniquissima fortunam haberemus, eruperunt subito, qui occasione † quam virtute honores petere malebant. Fieri autem non potuit inter motus istos animorum, quin obmutescerent cives boni, et quasi repentina popularique tempestate perculsi ac prostrati tantum non obtorpescerent. Quicquid enim est dictum in eam sententiam, quæ tunc temporis populo deliranti perplacuit, ab eo licebat nemini, ne digitum quidem transversum, discedere. At vero, cum a strepitu illo tumultuque aures nostræ paululum conquieverint, quid tandem causæ est, cur, de Republica quid sentiamus, taciturnitate celemus diuturniore? Pudet, mehercule, pigetque nos referre, qualis fuerit "civium ardor prava jubentium," qui tres illos viros de gradu et statu suo deturbarit indignis modis, effeceritque, ut salutis suæ civitas perderet tot præsidia, atque ornamenta dignitatis. Animus etiam nunc horret meminisse, ut Respublica, sive ad capessendum, sive ad arripiendum, tota sit permissa Oratoribus, non de cœlo illis quidem repente delapsis, sed "stultis, novis, adolescentulis;" ‡ et in arcem optimæ causæ catervatim invadentibus.

---

* Hom. Iliad, ix. 443. † Liv. lib. vi. cap. 41.

‡ Nævius in Cic. de Senectute, p. 533.

Enimvero, quod in cives integerrimos prudentissimosque Senatores tam effrænate sæviit ignobile et malignum vulgus, illud, et posteris, necesse est, et inimicis debeat ludibrium.

Qui ad rerum gubernacula, quo jure, quave injuria, nunc assident, gloriolam ii, per nos licet, aucupentur caducam et inanem. Ingenio isto suo, qualecunque sit, gaudeant perfruanturque; sibi plaudant mirifice; et κάλλος illud suum κακῶν* ὕπουλον dictis phaleratis ostentent. Atqui omnibus qui libero et ingenuo fastidio judicant, videntur ad honores adipiscendos nudi venisse atque inermes, nulla cognitione rerum, nulla scientia ornati.†

In rebus fere omnibus quæ optimo cuique pudorem incutiunt, habet profecto eorum causa quosdam colores, quibus possint imperitioribus fucum facere. Haud temere est igitur, quod sese tempestivis conviviis caute subducunt, et νηφαλίοις θεοῖς quam Baccho malunt litare, siquidem memoriæ proditum est, et Demosthenem πρὸς ὕδωρ γράψαι,‡ et Cæsarem ad Rempublicam evertendam accessisse sobrium.§ Quod leges figunt refiguntque, populo plaudente, idcirco videntur properare ad exemplar illius Oratoris, qui cum interrogatus esset πῶς ὁ βυζαντίων ἔχοι νόμος, nulla usus circuitione verborum, respondit, ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω.‖ Si flosculis sententiarum, verborumque lenociniis, et vitiosa sui jactatione vulgus captant, eodem plane, quo M. Cicero,

* Sophoc. Œd. Tyr. 1409. † De Orat. l. iii. p. 130.
‡ Lucian. Dem. Enc. par. 15. edit. Reitz.
§ Sueton. lib. 1. par. 53. & Quintil. lib. viii. cap. 2.
‖ Sext. Empir. advers. Math. p. 71.

animi morbo laborant, Si, contortulas per quæstiunculas et sophismata aculeata, quantum profecerint in Dialectica, ostendunt, credibile est illos prodiisse e familia Socraticorum, quibus id palmarium fuerit

—— τὸν ἥττονα
Νικᾶν λόγον λέγοντα τἀδικώτατα.*

Si recentibus præceptorum studiis flagrantes, simulant se mores induisse paulo asperiores, quam in Juvenibus ipsa Natura patiatur, ecquis perneget eos meminisse Platonici illius præcepti τὰ σοφρόνων ἀρχόντων ἤθη δριμύτητος, καὶ τινὸς ἰταμότητος ὀξείας καὶ πρακτικῆς ἐνδεῖσθαι ?† Ipsi cum novi sint homines, si novis rebus student, ac recentia quæque, insignia ore adhuc alio indicta effutiunt, illud ipsum "Atticos‡ inquilinos" apprime decet; Atticique illius νεωτερίσμου proprium redolet saporem. Sibi si videntur posse omnia, remque populi tractant tumultuose, et magno cum conatu magnas nugas agunt, vulgi in opinionibus probe sciunt perfugium esse, quo se recipiant. Νέῳ μὲν γὰρ ἴσως ἐπέοικε καθ' Ὅμηρον πάντα· καὶ ἔχονται καὶ ἀγαπῶσι, τὰ μὲν μικρὰ καὶ πολλὰ πράξαντα, δημοτικὸν καὶ φιλόπονον, τὰ δὲ λαμπρὰ καὶ σεμνὰ γενναῖον καὶ μεγαλόφρονα καλοῦντες· ἔστι δ' ὅπου καὶ τὸ φιλόνεικον καὶ παράβολον, ὥραν ἔχει τινὰ καὶ χάριν ἐπιπρέπουσαν τοῖς§ τηλικούτοις. Quid quod negotia quæ susceperint ad defendendum minus apta, "rebus extrinsecus adductis," cujusmodi

---

* Aristoph. Nub. 914. † Stobœus, p. 319.
‡ Aristot. Rhet. lib. ii. cap. 17.
§ Plutarch, tom. ii. p. 793. edit. Xyl.

sunt Bellum Americanum et Coälitio quæ dicitur, "circumliniunt?" "ac si defecerint alia, conviciis implent vacua causarum, si contingit, veris; si minus, fictis: modo sit materia ingenii, interque audiendum excitent clamores?"* Hanc ipsam maledicendi sartaginem, hunc nigræ succum loliginis et æruginem meram, hanc † caninam, uti Appius ait, Eloquentiam, sunt qui verbis decoris obvolvant, et in partes suas collo obtorto trahant Pindari hæc verba,

—— Χρὴ πᾶν ἔρ-
δοντ' ἀμαυρῶσαι τὸν ἐχθρόν. ‡

Ad plebeculam quod attinet, liceat ei, cum levis sit atque infida, homunciones sui simillimos in sinu fovere. Est utique τοῖς πολλοῖς persuasissimum, multis jactatam gravissimisque tempestatibus navem reipublicæ, tandem aliquando in tuto esse collocatam. Res credunt suas nunc demum omnes leni fluere et secundo cursu. Vota etiam, quæ, haud scio, an a numinibus exaudita sint malignis, ea jactitant esse ad felices exitus omnino omnia perducta.

Hujusmodi sane rumusculi nostras sæpe ad aures pervenerunt. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τοι οὐ ταχυπειθεῖς. Quin usu venit nobis, qui rerum ipsarum momenta ponderamus, in alia omnia ire. At enim uno ore omnes omnia bona de Palinuro nostro certatim dicunt! Id se ut habet, equidem haud crediderim, aut rerum prudentiam,§ aut eloquentiam, quæ solida et robusta sit, ante pilos venire. Nec vero Reipub-

* Quintilian, lib. xii. c. 2. † Ibid. cap. 3.
‡ Pind. Isth. 4. § Persil. Sat. 4.

licæ is mihi gerendæ patiens peritusque esse videtur, qui mellitis verborum globulis, tinnituque periodorum, et manus intra pallium non contentæ* ipsa majestate, multitudini fecerit silentium. Sed nimirum majus est quiddam quam vulgo opinantur, reipublicæ procurandæ ratio. Non istam inanem sine usu loquacitatem, non cantilenam ex scholis, non orationis cincinnos et fucos illa quidem profecto desiderat. Non assiduitatis est meræ, et operarum harum quotidianarum. Contra ea plurimis ex artibus et studiis, quæ veluti comites ministrique oratoris sunt, multis consiliis multaque exercitatione colligi debebit.

Magnum, si quod aliud, ejus qui republicæ præest, nomen videtur, magna species, magna dignitas, ut angustiæ pectoris juvenilis, rerumque insolentia civilium non sustinere possint tantam personam, tam gravem, tam severam.† Liceat plane Pindaro, qui in ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις versatus sit, de Damophilo composite ornateque dicere,

Κεῖνος γαρ' ἐν παισὶ νέος·
Ἐν δὲ βουλαῖς πρέσβυς, ἐγκύρσας ἑκατονταετεῖ βιοτᾷ.‡

Fuit autem, ut opinio mea fert, etiam a Tiberio,§ illud quidem certe cautum præclare, "ut ne quis adolescentium animos præmaturis honoribus ad superbiam attolleret." Etenim vix aut ne vix quidem reperiendus est, qui ineunte ætate docuerit, "ab ex-

* Quintil. lib. xii. cap. 10. † Orat. in Pis. par. 5. ed. Delph.
‡ Pyth. iv. 501. § Tacit. Annal. iv. par. 17.

cellenti eximiaque * virtute progressum ætatis expectari non opportere." Profecto et potest et solet cursus militaris virtutis esse celerrimus. Inde factum est, ut res maximas gereret Macedo ille Alexander, utque populi Romani imperium augerent superior Africanus † et Titus Flamininus, admodum adolescentes consules creati. At diversa est ratio eorum, qui pacatis in Temporibus ad Republicam æquo citius accesserunt. Vim illi omnem ingenii plerumque consumserunt in populari ‡ levitate. Potentiam inutilem, dominandique lubricam et præcipitem cupiditatem veræ solidæque gloriæ anteposuerunt. Ac mihi quidem videntur frustra argutari, qui rationibus hisce famam Luculli opponunt. Viro illi egregio contigisse fateor incredibilem quandam ingenii magnitudinem, quæ indocilem usus disciplinam non desideraret, et omnium opinionem quæ de ejus virtute fuisset, bellica laude vinceret. At vero idem ille adolescentiam § in forensi opere et Quæsturæ diuturnum tempus in Asiæ pace consumserat. Ad Consulatum non accessit, antequam et Quæstor et Ædilis et Prætor factus fuerat. Habuisse fertur divinam quandam rerum memoriam, in qua insculptum hæreret, quodcunque vel audiisset vel vidisset. Omni litterarum generi et Philosophiæ deditus erat. Secum assidue habebat Antiochum, qui ingenio scientiaque putabatur Philosophos fere omnes præstare. Atque harum rerum omnium ad laudem maximè antecellentium, vix unam esse puto, quæ in τὸν δεῖνα conveniat.

---

* Cic. Philipp. v. p. 515. † Ibid.
‡ Phil. v. p. 516. § Ciceron. Academ. lib. iv. sub. init.

Atticum* ferunt suscepti negotii nunquam pertæsum esse: quod quidem ὁ δεῖνα minime admirabile statuit esse in eo, qui Reipublicæ procurationem judicio fugisset. Aliam ipse viam ad laudem primus invenit. Aliam, suo Marte, invexit regendæ civitatis rationem. Quippe profundo ipse se de industria mersat, ut pulchrior evenisse videatur. Opes ducit animumque ex hoc ipso, quod magnis atque immanibus ausis iterum sæpiusque excidit. Quinetiam vincendi cum nec spes sibi ulla nec facultas sit, certamen, dedita opera, sibi cum hominibus disertissimis instituit, ut fallendo effugiendoque de iis triumphos agat. Qui autem lucro sibi apponendum putat, quod conatus sui vel irriti cesserint sua sponte, vel ab adversariis infracti sint et contusi, τί ἂν ἐποίει, ἢ τίνας ἂν εἶπε λόγους, εἰ συνέβη κατορθῶσαι αὐτῷ ἃ πολιτεύεσθαι ἐβούλετο.

Qui splendida ejus de se promissa exaudiunt, eundemque vident negotiis tot tantisque implicitum et constrictum, jure optimo possunt exclamare. Μητίοχος μὲν στρατηγεῖ, Μητιόχος δὲ τὰς ὁδοὺς, Μητιόχος δὲ ἄρτους ἐποπτᾷ, Μητιόχος δὲ τὰ ἄλφιτα, Μητιόχος δὲ πάντα ποιεῖται.‡ Sin autem aliorum expectationem fefellerint consilia, quæ sane ab ipso suscepta esse videantur, non tam perficiendi spe quam experiendi voluntate: si gravior aliqua facta fuerit ex improviso, temporum perturbatio: si bellum ali-

---

* Corn. Nep. vit. Att. cap. 15.

† Dinarch. Orat. contra Demoth.

‡ Plutarch. tom. iv. p. 811. edit Xyl. et Grotii excerpt. Trag. et Com. Gr. p. 917.

quando exarserit, tum demum illæ pertristes vulgi ore increbrescent voces, Μητιόχος δὲ οἰμώξεται. *

Qui sibi videntur multum in posterum prospicere, et ex usu rerum maximarum, potius quam ex conjectura, argumenta sua instituunt, consilia τοῦ δεῖνα, quantum ad speciem, et colorem civitatis adjunxissent, tantum a succo ejus et sanguine detraxisse arbitrantur. Atqui compertum ille habet se in campum descendisse, in quo vel ingenium, vel fiducia sui excurreret et cognosceretur. Alii interea, possint, necne, vel principium eorum, quæ ipse proposuerit, invenire, vel exitum evolvere, de ea quidem re non magnopere laborat. Rerum quippe ipsarum, cum magnitudinem, tum multo magis ipsam novitatem, eo valere intelligit, ut animos hominum vehementer percellant, et ad causas, quæ in paucorum voluntatibus abditæ et retrusæ sint, magna cum inanitate et errore explorandas incitent. †

Ἐπὶ τὸ καινουργεῖν φέρει
Τὸν νοῦν ἐκεῖνος, τοῦτο γιγνώσκων ὅτι
Ἐν καινὸν ἐγχείρημα, κἂν τολμηρὸν ᾖ
Πολλῶν παλαιῶν ἐστὶ χρησιμώτερον.

Nobis sane videntur homines Politici æque ac Philosophi, non singulis ex vocibus judicandi, sed ex rerum perpetuitate ‡ et constantia. Itaque quæ vel gesta a τῷ δεῖνα, vel tentata maxime laudantur, ea breviter summatimque perstringamus.

Hibernicis in rebus quas trahere ad arbitrium malebat, quam lenibus ducere imperiis aut lenibus

* Ibid. † Antiphanes in Alcestide.
‡ Cic. Tusc. Quæst. lib. v. cap. 10.

consiliis sequi, persæpe ab illo offensum et titubatum est.

Senatus non corrigendi modo, sed nova tanquam incude diffingendi causa, omnes effudit vires animi et ingenii sui: omnes in hac re una nervos intendit. Sed vicit, nescio quomodo, pars major eam, quæ a τῷ δεῖνα melior vocabatur. Quo quidem facto, refrixit in mente τοῦ δεῖνα omnis ille ardor, diligentia omnis relanguit, et spes omnis sanandæ civitatis extenuari jam visa est ac penitus infringi. Hinc illud est, quod ii qui specie libertatis insaniunt, de verbis sibi datis conqueruntur, atque adeo patronum, in quem causa omnis inclinata recumbebat, illum ipsum clamitant,

ἕτερον φρεσὶ κεύθειν, ἄλλο δὲ βάζειν.*

Quod ad σεισαχθείαν† attinet, quam Solonis nostri sub auspiciis futuram esse aiunt in publicis Vectigalibus, δεδία μὴ ἄνθρακας τὸν θήσαυρον εὕρωμεν ἀνεγρόμενοι.‡

Exteras autem inter gentes quæ videntur modo cæcas struere insidias, modo consilia intendere calida et audacia, si quid mali nobis nec-opinantibus eruperit, multa, quæ ex intervallo non apparent, res ipsa aperiet, εὑρήσει τε τὰ σάθρα τοῦ δεῖνα αὐτὸς ὁ πόλεμος.§

Nam quod fœdus est nuper cum Gallis initum, hujus vulgo creditur, illiusque, quod est olim Ultrajecti factum, non unam esse faciem, nec diversam

* Hom. Iliad. x. † Diog. Lært. Vit. Solonis. lib. i. p. 27.
‡ Lucian in Timon. § Demosth. Philipp. i. par. 15.

tamen. Dixerit quispiam, litora Gallorum nostris littoribus, et vero fata fatis cum consuetudine tum legibus quibusdam prope ipsius naturæ, esse contraria? Facile ὁ δεῖνα ejus argumenta hoc consilio pervertet.

> Κορινθίοις ἄχθεσθε· κἀκεῖνοι γέ σοι
> Νῦν εἰσὶ χρηστοὶ, καὶ σὺ νῦν χρηστὸς γενοῦ.*

" Annon Gallica vina Britannorum mercibus reparata, pateris de spumantibus hauriemus?"

> Οἷον πρὸς ἀλλήλας λαλοῦσιν αἱ πόλεις
> Διαλλαγεῖσαι, καὶ γελῶσιν ἄσμεναι,
> Καὶ ταῦτα δαιμονίως ὑπωπιασμέναι
> Ἀπαξάπασαι, καὶ κνάθοις προσκείμεναι.†

Contendunt scilicet οἱ Γαλλίζοντες, acriter contendit ὁ δεῖνα, omnes denique ejus fautores ὁμοθυμαδὸν καὶ ὁμοφώνως contendunt, fore, hoc fœdere perfecto, ut Galli positis armis mitescant, neque ex occulto vel insidiis aliquid agant.‡ Dulce fateor est nomen pacis—Rem vero ipsam, cum jucunda et salutaris sit, quovis fere pretio emerim. At verba hujusmodi, utrum a dolo hostium, an virtute profecta sint, haud quisquam addubitaverit. At Gallos§ quos ἀπειλοῦντας crediderim esse μάλιστα ἀξιοπίστους, eosdem illos tum maxime, cum dona ultro ferant, timendos esse statuerim. At pacis nomine bellum involutum reformido.

Enimvero pater τοῦ δεῖνα, si in vivis esset, ea omnia, quæ de hac cum Gallis familiaritate conflanda

---

* Aristoph. Eccles. 199. † Ibid. Pax. 538.
‡ Cic. Philip. 13. § Dem. Olynth. 3.

dicta sunt a filio, perflagitiosa ad loquendum esse clamitaret, et ad audiendum perturpia. Fulguraret more suo et tonaret contra eos, qui propter incertos exitus belli Martemque communem nimio sunt in metu. Diceret in senatu, esse omnino* fortium virorum, quales nos esse deberemus, virtute præstare tantum, ut possent fortunæ culpam non extimescere.

Λέγεταί τι καινόν; γενοίτο γὰρ ἄν τι καινότερον, ἢ Μακεδὼν μὲν ἀνὴρ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων διοικῶν, καὶ ὑπερεκπεπληγμένοι ὡς ἄμαχόν τινα οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν Φίλιππον, ὑμᾶς δὲ αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὴν ῥᾳθυμίαν καὶ ἀθυμιάν πείθων ἐθελοντὴς, καὶ φλυαρῶν, καὶ φιλιππίζων ὁ Δημοσθένης ὁ τοῦ Ὁμωνύμου αὐτῷ τοῦ μακαρίτου·† τιθασσεύει νὴ δία ὁ νεανίσκος χειροήθεις ὑμᾶς ποιῶν. Ἔστι δ' οὐδέποτ· οἶμαι μέγα τι καὶ νεανικὸν φρόνημα λαβεῖν, μικρὰ καὶ φαῦλα πράττοντας. ‡

Hostium promissa, quo cadant, quam fragiles sint humanæ res caducæque, quam inanes et fallaces nostræ de pace, quæ diuturna esset futura, cogitationes, ipsa belli suspicio satis comprobavit. Videmur sane breve in tempus cura et metu esse relevati. Nec vero dissimulandum esse arbitror, quam diligenter ὁ δεῖνα ad salutem patriæ aliquando incubuerit; idque ut occurreret atque obstaret consiliis Gallorum, quos paucis ante mensibus Populi Anglicani socios et amicos esse dictatasset. Bellum cum ostendisset pacem habuit. Sed rem tantam, tamque præclaram subito inchoatam relin-

---

* Philip. xiii. † Demosth. Phil. ii. Olynth. 1.
‡ Demosth. Olynth. 2.

quere, fortis animi et constantis non erat. Quid enim? norunt omnes, quam sit lubrica Gallorum fides, quam importuna eorundem ambitio, et perniciosa. Norunt etiam, quantæ sint tenebræ et caligo temporum nostrorum, quantæ rebus Europearum gentium procellæ jamdudum impendeant, quanta jam in Borealibus regionibus concitata sit atque intonuerit tempestas. Profecto hoc, quicquid est mali, longius opinione disseminatum est, penitusque infixum in ipsis radicibus cupiditatum, et libidinum regiarum. Sed prolatando et differendo regum πολεμητειόντων consilia, vel infringi, vel impediri nullo modo possunt. Quacunque ratione præcidendæ sunt belli causæ, celeriterque et vigilanter, et fortiter, ipsum bellum profligandum est. *Πότε οὖν ἃ χρὴ πράξομεν; ἐπειδάν τι γένηται; νῦν δὲ τί χρὴ τὰ γιγνόμενα ἡγεῖσθαι· οὐ γὰρ οἷοι τε εἰσὶν οἱ ἐχθροὶ, ἔχοντες ἃ κατεστραμμένοι εἰσὶν, μένειν ἐπὶ τούτων· ἀλλ' αἰεί τι προσπεριβάλλονται.* * *ὁρῶ δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ νυνί οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ παθεῖν πόλεμον αἱρεσθαι μέλλοντας, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ κομίζεσθαι τὴν πρότερον οὖσαν ἑαυτοῖς δύναμιν.* † *Ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπειδὰν πυθώμεθά τι γιγνόμενον, τηνικαῦτα θορυβούμεθα, καὶ παρασκευαζόμεθα· εἶτ' οἶμαι συμβαίνει, τοῦς μὲν ἐφ' ἃ ἂν ἔλθωσι, ταὐτ' ἔχειν κατὰ πολλὴν ἡσυχίαν· ἡμῖν δ' ὑστερίζειν, καὶ ὅσα ἂν δαπανήσωμεν ἅπαντα μάτην ἀναλωκέναι.* ‡ *ὃ δὲ μοι πλείστην ἀθυμίαν ἀπάντων παρέσχηκεν, οὐκ ἀποκρύψομαι· ὅτι πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ὄντων χρημάτων, καὶ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ καὶ πόρων ἁπάντων, τούτων μὲν οὐδεὶς μέμ-*

* Philipp. 1. † Orat. pro Megalopol.
‡ De rebus in Cher.

νηται, τοῖν δυοῖν δὲ ὀβολοῖν * τοῖν ἐκ τόκου, καὶ τῶν καλανδῶν, † καὶ τῆς νουμηνίας ἅπαντες.

De stylo hujusce juvenis mea quæ sit sententia, idcirco difficile est proloqui, quod plerique sunt rei ipsius iniqui æstimatores, et hominis, de quo agitur, fautores ineptissimi. Si quid enim exquisitius acciderit auribus imperitorum, qualecunque sit id quod ipsi posse desperent, maximam habet admirationem. Qui autem plebe infima paulo plus sapiunt magis populare et plausibile existimant dicendi illud genus, quod puerilibus sententiolis lascivit, ‡ quod immodico tumore turgescit, quod inanibus locis bacchatur, et præcipitia habet pro sublimibus. Quam igitur eloquentiæ speciem Humius § ait se cogitatione et mente complexum fuisse, re ipsa non vidisse, eam credunt in τῷ δεῖνα eluxisse aliquando—Oratorem, quem animo ille tenebat, manu se ipsi somniant || prehendere, Juvenem utique acerrimo præditum ingenio, optimis disciplinis penitus imbutum, rerum civilium HAUD IGNARUM, qui in senatu auspicato assurgens aures nostras semper impleat, qui omnes affectus moveat vehementer, nitidusque et sublimis et locuples circumfluentibus undique eloquentiæ copiis imperet.

Hancce autem dicendi, quæ sentiam, occasionem nactus, paulo jam liberius enunciabo, quod semper tacui, et sane causis gravissimis adductus, adhuc

---

* Orat. de Repub. ordinand.

† Plutarch. de Vitand. Ære Alien. Anglicè, Settling-day between the Bulls and Bears.

‡ Quintil. lib. xii. cap. 10.

§ Essay 13th, on Eloquence.

|| Cicer. de perfect. Orat.

tacendum putavi. Maxime in hoc juvene splendescit pictum quoddam orationis et floridum genus, quod quidem cum e Sophistarum fontibus in senatum defluxisse totum videatur, spretum est plerumque a subtilibus, idemque a gravibus repulsum. Habet autem ὁ δεινα (id quod unice laudandum statuo) facultatem illam dicendi ex tempore, quod præmium est,* uti veteres dictitabant, vel amplissimum longi laboris. Quæcunque ei demum acciderit necessitas, primo motu corporis, prima jactatione † manus, prima pedis supplosione, copiæ ‡ verborum veluti milites Pompeiani duci suo sacramento addicti, promunt se, atque in medium evocatæ prosiliunt. Per id mirum quoque semper mihi visum est, solere illum, in perpetuitate sermonis et celeritate maxima; solere, inter ambitus sententiarum longissime circumductos; solere inter vel abruptas vel flexuosas interclusiones παρατηρεῖν τὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογὴν καὶ τῆς συνθεσέως τὴν ἀκρίβειαν,§ ut in verbum, quod a Grammaticorum regulis aberret, ne unum quidem incidat—huic vero facilitati illud etiam accedit, quod tenorem quendam in disputando servat, et ordinem eum qui cogitationibus necessitate quodammodo expressis aptissimus est, recte, maximam partem, disponit. Nunquam intersistit ejus oratio claudicatve. Nunquam aut hesitare videtur, aut, rebus duabus animo obversantibus, utra sit earum vel aptior ad usum, vel ad ornatum magis decora, punctum temporis, deliberare. Sunt autem, qui

* Quintil. lib. x. cap. vii. † Ibid.

‡ Strad. prol. Academ. i. et Launcelot, act. iii. sc. ii. Mercat. Ven. § Dion. Halicar. ἀρχαίων κρίσις, de Simon.

rerum illas imagines, quæ tanto cum impetu feruntur, nimis * recentes esse existiment, ita tamen, ut easdem, si incudi redderentur, ornatiores magisque factas fore evasuras non credant.

Sonitus ille παρασήμων καὶ Ἀττικῶν † ῥημάτων, etsi nervorum ei minus inest, plurimum tamen venustatis nonnunquam habet. Est etiam, ubi sententia rerum vocabulis ornatissimis subjecta aut pertenuis est aut plane nulla. Ipsa porro verba sæpe insolens quiddam et odiosum sonant. Sæpe orationis seriem, quæ in aures influebat percommodè, illam ipsam oculis fidelibus subjectam si dissolvas, exile fit nescio quid, et fractum, et languidulum.

Oratorem non solum ‡ gravem sed interdum trucem τὸν δεῖνα esse scimus omnes, ut sæpe necesse sit ejus inhumanitatem acriter propulsare et retundere. Ad ridiculum is tamen nonnunquam divertitur, sive ut animos auditorum a satietate renovet reficiatque, sive etiam ut ingenio suo parum miti morem gerat. His autem in dicteriis, quæ orationi suæ aspergit, nec salsum, nec urbanum, nec facetum unquam consequi potest, palamque ostendit sibi, æque ac § Demostheni, non tam displicuisse jocos, quam non contigisse.

Ferunt Cassium Severum, omissa modestia et pudore, non tam pugnasse in dicendo quam rixatum esse. Jam vero quod Severus neque || infirmitate ingenii, neque inscitia litterarum fecit, idem est

* Quintil. lib. x. cap. 7.
† Epigr. Cereal. Brunck Analect, tom. ii. p. 345.
‡ Liv. lib. xxxiv. cap. 5. § Quintil. lib. vi. cap. 3.
|| Dialogus de Orat.

etiam a τῷ δεῖνα factitatum judicio et consilio. Cujus autem vix adumbrationem facetiarum et gravitatis in dicendo habet, ejusdem acerbitatem dentemque maledicum, vel imitando vel suopte ingenio effingit atque exprimit. Quare hunc custodem et conservatorem civium suorum cum videbam pene latrantem in Senatu, et adversarios morsu acerrimo lacerantem, sæpe mihi veniebat in mentem Syracusani illius clamatoris.

——"Εοικεν, ἡνίκ' ἂν λέγῃ,
Τοῖς κυνιδίοισι τοῖσιν ἐπὶ τῶν τειχέων·
Ἀναβὰς γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμ' ὑλακτεῖ.*

Quod autem in τῷ δεῖνα maxime desidero, longe diversum est ab his, de quibus hactenus dixi, longeque majus. Etenim scientiam illam civilem, quæ summa in oratore debet esse, in eo non vidi: non cognitionem earum rationum, quæ de naturis humani generis et moribus, a philosophis explicantur: non denique vim illam, quæ in animorum motibus inflammandis potissimum dominatur, atque in mentibus eorum, qui audiunt, quasi aculeos quosdam relinquit. Fuerit igitur sermo ejus a circulatoria volubilitate paulo remotior. Fuerit idem artificio quodam et perpolitione distinctus. Numeris subinde ornatus fuerit, qui sua sponte defluxisse, non arcessiti et coacti esse videantur. Eloquentiam tamen si eam solam statuis esse veram, quæ animos hominum modo infringat, modo irrepat in sensus; quæ novas opiniones inserat, "deque pulmone," ut cum Persio † loquar, "veteres avias revellat," faten-

* Eupolis ἐν Πυλαῖς. † Sat. 3.

dum est profecto τὸν δεῖνα, ne in rutis* quidem et cæsis, solium paternum recepisse.

Nimirum ὁ δεῖνα est vehemens feroxque natura; neque enim fas esse putat verbum ex ore exire cujusquam, quod non jucundum et honorificum ad aures suas accidat. Id vero ipsum maxime me impellit, ut audaciam ejus paulisper comprimam, et loquacitatem istam, qua possim, hisce interrogatiunculis irretitam retardem.

Num ad ambitiosa, quibus orationes ejus enitescunt, ornamenta, adjungit etiam illa, quæ ex eruditione liberali ducta, et ferri solent et laudari ea in ætatula, cui plurimum favetur? Num historias movet eas, quæ in fastis temporum recentiorum positæ sunt? Num ex veteri memoria, et monumentis,† et litteris, haurit exempla, quæ quidem solent et auctoritatis plurimum habere ad probandum, et jucunditatis ad audiendum? Num verba illa ardentia et sententias vibrantes, quæ doctiori cuique inter legendum arrident, rei, qua de agitur, accommodat, suæque intexit orationi? Auditores ejus fautoresque num gratulari sibi possunt de eo, quod est à Timotheo dictum de omnibus, qui apud Platonem cœnulas jucunde produxissent, ὡς καὶ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ καλῶς γίνονται?‡ Num qua ejus feruntur in ore vulgi, aut sapientiæ plenissima aut facetiarum ἀπομνημονεύματα, id quod idem ille Plato dicebat iis contingere qui per specimina ingenii et doctrinæ sæpius populo data potuissent ὀνόματος τυχεῖν?§

* Cic. de Orat. lib. ii. p. 115. † In Ver. lib. iii. p. 266.
‡ Athen. lib. x. lin. 419. et Ælian. V. H. lib. ii. cap. 10.
§ Diog. Laert. in Vit. Platonis Segm. 38.

Ecquid reconditi profert in medium? ecquid expectatione dignum eorum, quibus libere et docte licet judicare? ecquid aut inauditum hominibus usu et exercitatione instructis, aut etiam mediocribus oratoribus omnino novum? NIL HORUM. Quæ cum ita sint, non illum negaverim ista omnia communia et contrita dicendi præcepta edidicisse. Illud etiam tribuerim, boni Oratoris esse multa auribus accipere; multa itidem,* furtim et cursim attingere legendo. Si quid autem aptius et exquisitius in orationibus ejus, (quamvis rara avis est) si quid tamen unquam exiit, id omne mihi videtur ὁ δεῖνα non ut suum possidere, sed libasse ut alienum.†

Haud sane diu est, cum se in cancellos et conciunculas tanquam in pistrinum quoddam detrudi et compingi indignatus est. Quæ autem aliis tradi solent certa quadam via et ratione, ea omnia credibile est eum hausisse ab ipsa natura, aut raptim leviterque primoribus labris attigisse. Inde fit, ut verborum gurgite‡ in vasto, communes loci, qui Latine scripti sint, rari nantes appareant, hic videlicet a Lucano petitus, ille a Livio: puerulis uterque et litteratoribus notissimus. Inde fit, ut argumenta ejus persæpe declamatorem de ludo sapiant: convicia ejusdem, rabulam de foro.

Minime ei cedat in laudem, quod ancipites dicendi incertosque casus non extimescit, aut incredibilem rerum ipsarum, quæ tractandæ sunt, magnitu-

* Cic. de Orat. lib. i. p. 99. † Ibid.
‡ Warburton, præf. ad Shaksp.

dinem et difficultatem contemnit. Marcus enim Crassus se fatetur id sæpissime expertum esse, ut exalbesceret in principiis orationis et tota mente atque omnibus artubus contremisceret.* Fatetur etiam M. Cicero† se, cum illius diei sibi venisset in mentem, quo die sibi dicendum esset, non modo commoveri animo esse solitum, sed etiam perhorrescere toto corpore. At nemo est, qui τὸν δεῖνα unquam viderit, aut metu aliquo paulisper fractum, aut ingenuo et infanti, qualis juvenem deceret, pudore debilitatum. Esse quosdam scio quibus admirabile hoc ipsum videatur. M. autem Crasso judice,‡ ne illi quidem qui facillime et ornatissime dicunt, impudentiæ nomen debent effugere, nisi timide ad dicendum accedant, et in ordienda oratione aliquantulum conturbentur.

Ferri solent in juvenibus etiam uberiora paulo et pene periclitantia. At nihil est in natura rerum, quod se universum semel profundat, aut quod totum repente evolet. Oratoris itaque si præpropere§ distringatur frons immatura, et acerbum quidque ab eo temere proferatur, omnia quæ bene nata fuerint aut parata in vita meliore, penitus dedecorantur. Quid enim? annon fundamenta jaciuntur arrogantiæ?‖ annon vires prævenit fiducia? annon tumidus fit quidam orator, suique jactans, et¶ facundus malo publico?

Jam si causis, quæ inter se confligunt, omissis,

---

* Cic. de Orat. lib. i. p. 94. † Divinat. in Cæcil. par. 10.
‡ Cic. de Orat. lib. i. p. 94. § Quint. l. xii. c. 6.
‖ Ibid. ¶ Vel. Paterc lib. ii. cap. 48.

ipsam τοῦ δεῖνα et Foxii eloquentiam contendere quispiam me velit, ad verba Dionysii confugiendum est, quibus dilucide possim et accurate exponere, ὃ πρὸς ἀμφοτέρας πάσχω τὰς λέξεις· οἶομαι δὲ κοινόν τι πάθος ἁπάντων ἐρεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἐμὸν ἴδιον μόνον· ὅταν μέν τινα τῶν τοῦ δεῖνα ἀναγινώσκω λόγων πολὺ τὸ εὐσταθὲς ἔχω τῆς γνώμης, ὥσπερ οἱ τῶν σπονδείων αὐλημάτων, ἢ τῶν δακτυλίων τε καὶ ἁρμονίων μερῶν ἀκροώμενοι· ὅταν δὲ τινὰ τοῦ Φωξίου λάβω λόγων, ἐνθουσιῶ τε, καὶ, δεῦρο κἀκεῖσε ἄγομαι, πάθος ἕτερον ἐξ ἑτέρου μεταλαμβάνων, ἀπιστῶν, ἀγωνιῶν, δεδιὼς, καταφρονῶν, μισῶν, ἐλεῶν, εὐνοῶν, ὀργιζόμενος, φθονῶν, ἅπαντα τὰ πάθη μεταλαμβάνων ὅσα κρατεῖν ἀνθρωπίνης γνώμης πέφυκε.*

Contigerit, necne, Humio, ea prudentia, quæ a divinatione prope abesse dicitur, non est nostrum dijudicare. At *hunc* scio non esse virum, quem Curiæ consulenti præsidium et decus futurum Philosophus ille promiserit. Alia ex parte, qui in rebus hisce sapit, et Jove, quod aiunt, æquo judicat, mecum, ni fallor, lubentissime faciet, cum Ciceronem affirmo, ea, quæ nuper facta sunt, cecinisse ut vatem: "Cum in dicendo sæpe par, nonnunquam etiam superior, visus esset is, qui, omisso studio sapientiæ, nihil sibi præter eloquentiam, comparasset, fiebat, ut et multitudinis, et suo judicio dignus, qui rempublicam gereret, videretur."†

Profecto juvenem huncce, modo in venditandis ineptiis αὐταρκῆ καὶ αὐτοδίδακτον, modo in arduis rebus ἄπορον καὶ ἀμήχανον si aspiceres, nihil fatereris

* Dion. Hal. Judic. de Dem. p. 176.

† Cic. Rhet. lib. i. p. 67.

unquam exstitisse "sic dispar sibi." Aliis in rebus iracundus acerque, conviciorum aculeis nihil non flagitat, aut pene vi et armis arrogat. In aliis fit simillimus Lancastrio, qualis describitur ab * equite illo, quem facetiis abundantem et cute bene curata nitidum, ass eclæ τοῦ δεῖνα oculis fugiunt, auribus respuunt, animis aspernantur,

Ψυχρὸν κέαρ τοῦ παιδίου θερμοῖς ἔπι·
Ὑδαρὲς τέ πως καὶ λεπτὸν αἷμ' δεὶ τρέφον
Νήφειν τ' ἀπιστεῖν τ' ἄρθρα τοῦ βίου λέγει,
Ἀγέλαστον, ἄφιλον, κἀπροσήγορον τέρας.

Certis quibusdam destinatisque sententiis ita est hodie consecratus, eaque, ut opinor, necessitate constrictus, et dogmaticorum more, etiam quæ minus probari possint, ea cogatur, sive dignitatis, sive constantiæ causa† defendere. Crastino die fit transfuga Academicorum ad partes, nihilque ducit tam temerarium tamque indignum sapientis gravitate, quam illud, quod non satis explorate cognitum sit, sine ulla dubitatione tueri.‡ Tum vero, furtivis coloribus ferox et præclarus, tanquam Cornicula, superbit; et, a quibus est mutuatus, quicquid in consiliis suis sanum et sincerum est, eorum pergit aures obtundere conviciis e trivio petitis.

§ A Minucio is quidem didicit, eum primum esse virum, qui ipse consulat, quid in rem sit: secundum autem eum, qui bene monenti obediat. Cavet itaque ne extremi esse ingenii ideo videatur, quod

---

* Henric. 4ti, Pars 2da, act iv. sc. 7.

† Cic. Tusc. Quæst. lib. ii. ‡ Cic. de Nat. Deorum, lib. i.

§ Liv. lib. xxii. c. 29.

[redacted]

et sua ipse negotia expedire et explicare nequeat, et simul aliorum consiliis regi nolit.

Sumasne ab alienis, tibi quod usui sit, pudenter, an importune rapias, "immane quantum distat." Sit tamen illud duræ necessitatis, quod, domi cum sit res angusta et exilis,

Convectare juvat prædas, et vivere rapto.*

Atqui opprobriis eos lacessere, per quos plurimum ipse profeceris, animi videtur esse invidi et pusilli, qui nec cedere velit, nec, certamine æquis conditionibus comparato, possit victoriam adversariis extorquere. Nempe qui doceri ab hostibus haud nefas esse statuit, ipse oportet "Hostis Teucros † laude" aliquantulum prosequatur.

Minime est interea dissimulandum posse ex adversariis τοῦ δεῖνα quosdam reperiri, quos veluti, παθὼν νήπιος ‡ tangere omnino nolit. Hoc nimirum illud est, quod ne sui quidem Senatus plausu solet gaudere, quoties famam captat dicacis in illo viro, qui cum Oratorem maximum, tum acerrimum Jaculatorem sese præbuit: qui, et causæ cujusque qui sit color, et § sagittæ quibus ex armamentariis veniant, probe novit: qui denique nec Hyperidi aut Lysiæ acumine et subtilitate || cedit, nec facetiis et salibus Atticis Aristophani aut Menandro.

Ne "bellum incidat disparibus, ipse tanquam pigrior ὁ δεῖνα nonnunquam discedit, vehementerque optat occasionem se nancisci posse "mu-

* Virg. Æn. 1. † Æn. 1.
‡ Hesiod. Op. et Dies 218. § Juvenal, Sat. vii.
|| Cic. Orator, p. 161.

nerum ultro mittendorum."* Hoc vero fieri cum nequeat, omnes istos aculeos et tortuosum genus disputandi totum, homo bellissimus relinquit. Adversarium ita laudat, ut se fateatur eundem pertimescere. Ita contra illum dicit, quamvis ipse sit ingeniosus, ut gravissimum etiam de suo ingenio judicium fieri arbitretur. Cum Sheridano qui congreditur, is utique, mirum foret, ni tela imbellia abjiceret, ni viribus parceret consulto, modestiaque et temperando linguæ,† adolescens, ne a viris facetis vinceretur, ipse se et dicacitatem suam vinceret. Alii item aut conticescant oportet, aut demissius se gerant veteratores in disputando vafri et malitiosi. Etenim ad magnam rerum cognitionem multa in Sheridano accedunt, quæ in Oratore apprime necessaria sunt. Norunt experti quantus sit ejus in jocando lepos, quanta libero homine digna eruditio, quanta celeritas brevitasque respondendi et lacessendi, cum argutiis exquisitissimis atque urbanitate mirifice conjuncta.‡

Oratorem aiunt vel mediocrem, modo sit aliquid in eo, tenere hominum § aures. Sed, tanta cum turba sit faventium τῷ δεῖνα, fateor me vix in ullum de iis incidisse, qui minima ex parte, cum Sheridano comparari possit. Uni, forsan, et alteri eorum, non ingenium omnino, sed oratorium ingenium deest, Mediocriter sunt alii a doctrina instructi, et multo angustius a natura, vix ut in dicentium numero habendi sint, nedum disertorum. Cæteri autem ig-

* Horat. Sat. 7. lib. i. † Vide Liv. 28. et Orat. τοῦ δεῖνα.
‡ Cicer. de Orat. lib. i. p. 89. § Brut. p. 147.

noti homines et repentini, oratores celeriter facti sunt, oppidano quodam et incondito genere dicendi. Missos igitur faciamus fortemque Gyam fortemque Cloanthum, ne suspicantes quidem quid sit ornate loqui, et ad laborem cogitandi plane inhabiles. In eadem vero trutina, qua Sheridanum, juvenes posuerim duos, quorum hunc, jure appellaveris πρωταγωνιστὴν, illum, secundarum partium actorem.

Promta est et parata τοῦ δεῖνα in agendo celeritas, nihil ut sit in illo genere magis plausibile. Eum vero acumine et nonnunquam diligentia, sale semper et lepore superat Sheridanus.

Τῷ δεῖνα accedit, longo proximus intervallo, sed proximus tamen, Grenvillius, is, qui et impar congressus cum hoste, et victus, pretium aliquod certaminis ex eo ipso tulisse dicitur, quod cum Sheridano certavisset. Docti hujusce, quod satis sit, adolescentuli, prudens quædam et considerata tarditas est, atque industria valde probabilis. At Sheridanus illum vincit expediendis conficiendisque rebus, fitque, quod admodum difficile est, idem et peror-natus et perbrevis.

Possunt profecto Oratores esse summi, qui maxime sunt inter se dissimiles. Quid igitur vetat quo minus Sheridanum conferamus cum aliis quibusdam hominibus disertis, qui, vel ardore ei propiores sint, vel amicitia et voluntate conjunctiores?

Tribus illis viris, quorum a me sæpe facta est mentio, ita evenit, ut, cum suo quisque in genere plenus Orator, et prope jam perfectus evaserit, non tamen quisquam ex iis felix sit ab ulla laude, quæ omnibus sit communis. At Sheridanum pene dix-

erim, et consecutum esse, quod eorum singulis contigit, et, quod defuit, sæpe eundem explere. Etenim, quicquid aureo flumine eloquentiæ fundit Burkius: quicquid est in Northio urbanitatis et sine molestia diligentis elegantiæ: quicquid Foxius habet, vel subtilitatis, vel lacertorum, vel gravis et incitatæ et flexanimæ orationis, id omne Sheridanus ita complectitur, ut, qui secunda in arte primus sit, idem ille, de prima contendens suo quasi jure sibi secundas vindicet. Illud adeo prope adest ut eloquentia sua Sheridanus præstiterit, quod Athenienses videntur ab iis, qui tragœdias facerent multum et frustra exegisse, *γεγονότων γὰρ καθ' ἕκαστον μέρος ἀγαθῶν ποιητῶν, ἑκάστου τοῦ ἰδίου ἀγαθοῦ ἀξιοῦσι τὸν ἕνα ὑπερβάλλειν.**

Causa illa publica contra præfectum quendam nuperrime dicta, quantum commendationis ad gratiam et ad famam habuit? Quanta vocis et animi contentione Sheridanus ad se auditores convertit omnes omnium et ordinum, et ætatum, et partium? Quam mirum in modum, et voluptate mentes eorum devinxit, et illuc quo res poscebat, etiam invitas impulit?

Hanc utique ad causam veniebat paratissimus—expectabatur—audiebatur—A principio statim videbatur, dignus expectatione. Rem illam omnem, quæ tractanda erat, tam variam, tamque multiplicem, et abstrusam complectebatur memoriter, et acute dividebat. Argumenta collocabat suo quæque loco, ubi plurimum efficere et valere possent. Longa in

* Arist. Poetic. cap. 17.

oratione magnopere cavebat, ne ita aliquando aliquid emitteret imprudenter, vel consulto et aperte præstaret, ut sibi ipsi non conveniret. Sermonem, pro re nata, variabat aptissime. Hac in parte, abundanter et illuminate dicebat: arctius, in illa, et angustius loquebatur, veritatemque disputando limabat. Auditores suos pro arbitrio vel docebat—vel delectabat—vel movebat. Nihil tamen unquam propositi habere videbatur, nisi rem ut definiret: ut robustam hominis improbitatem signis omni luce clarioribus coargueret: ut id, quod intenderet, exquisitis rationibus confirmaret. Pertimescebat tum primum Scotus iste clamator audacissimus, et quamvis loquacissimus sit, penitus obmutescebat. Suæ autem vocis bonam partem ad Sheridani rationes ὁ δεῖνα adjungebat, vel quod Oratorem extra omnem ingenii aleam positum esse persentisceret, vel quod crederet sic exstingui posse veterum suorum famam maledictorum.

Illo sane tempore multæ erant in Sheridano, non scurriles, sed oratoriæ facetiæ. Sæpe erat liquida et fusa, nec tamen redundans et circumfluens oratio. Vehemens eadem erat identidem, et interdum irata, et plena justi doloris. Ea denique vis erat, is splendor, ea copia et varietas, quam magnitudo illius causæ et dignitas postulabant.

Oratio illa, sciunt omnes, quo plausu sit in Senatu excepta: quas Sheridani ex adversariis expresserit atque extorserit laudes: quantus inde ejus vel ad popularitatem innoxiam honestamque, vel etiam ad gloriam solidam et sempiternam cumulus accesserit. Obstupescent certe posteri decies illam lectam rele-

gentes, eruntque iis sæpe in pectore et in ore Æschinea illa verba paululum mutata, "Quid si ipsum audiissemus?"*

Fuerit Bellum Americanum et susceptum malis avibus et gestum. Fuerit illud in manibus τοῦ δεῖνα tanquam Κερκυραία τις† μάστιξ, cujus vis omnis dirigenda sit in unius hominis caput et famam. Civium, quanquam periculo armorum liberantur, fuerint tamen animi in ejusdem hominis perniciem armati. At spectatum ea, quæ in Senatu fiunt, admissus, nemo fibram tam corneam habet, ut risum tenere possit. Res quædam agenda est de ‡ tribus Capellis. Comitum fit concursus, strepitusque, et clamor adolescentulorum.§ Tumultuantur, cachinnantur, de loco depugnant. Hæc dum fiunt homo quidam purpuratus Curiam ingreditur. Surgit continuo ὁ δεῖνα, triumque Capellarum paululum immemor, multa de vi et cæde, multa de Syllis et Mariis, multa de Cannis et perjuriis Punici furoris lingua personat audacissima et manu tota. Deos hominesque testatur bellum Americanum in causa fuisse, cur Titius istas tres Capellas a Caio furatus sit. Belli Americani contendit Northium exstitisse unum atque solum auctorem. Northium appellitat fatale quoddam portentum prodigiumque Reipublicæ. Northium clamitat, illaqueatum esse omnium legum periculis, irretitum || odio bonorum omnium, implicatum expectatione summi supplicii. Hæc ille et

* Quintil. lib. ii. cap. 3. † Vid. Præf. Taylori ad Lycurg.
‡ Martial. lib. vi. ep. 19. § Terent. Prol. ad Hec.
|| Cic. de Harusp. Resp. p. 411.

alia ejusdem farinæ dum funditat verbis tristissimis et voce maxima, obduruisse videtur, et usu ipso percalluisse incredibilis quædam Senatus patientia. Silent interea aut clanculum subrident Northii desertores et proditores salutis, illi ipsi, qui fœdissime Bellum Americanum quondam cauponati sunt, qui faces ad bellum Americanum sua sponte prætulerunt fœdas et luctuosas, qui toti et mente et animo institerunt ad bellum Americanum.

—— Nam quæ sibi quisque timebat
Unius in miseri exitium conversa tulere.*

Non eos fugit, in more positum esse τῷ δεῖνα, ut miseram et tenuem prædam sectari nolit—aprum quippe exoptat, aut leonem de monte descendere—quin immo multas credit sibi imagines, non solum ad intuendum, verum etiam imitandum, clarissimorum virorum expressas, a scriptoribus et Græcis et Latinis esse relictas.

Ἀλλ' Ἡρακλέους ὀργὴν τιν' ἔχων, τοῖσι μεγίστοις ἐπιχειρεῖ.†

Ad laudes hasce populares aliqui ferunt illas minus notas minusque pervulgatas, quæ cum litterularum Græcarum scientia conjunctæ sint, τὸν δεῖνα adjecisse. Quod si verum est, unum hoc reperio inter me ipsum atque illum amicitiæ vinculum posse intercedere, quod iisdem quondam studiis dediti simus. Qui autem in gradu tam excelso collocatur, poterit is sibi eodem jure, quo Sylla, felix videri. Moneo tamen illum atque etiam hortor, ne Græce si quando scribat, gyro nimis arcto Syllam

* Virg. Æn. 2.

† Aristoph. Pax 751.

imitetur, seque Ἐπαφρόδιτον* appellet. Porro, qui Lycurgeam severitatem in Orationibus præ se tulerit, neque tamen integritatem in moribus Lycurgeam expresserit, ei auctor fuerim, ut usu atque ætate se demitigari patiatur. Discat velim a Cicerone, Oratorem oportere insanabiles vitare contumelias: tantummodo adversarios figere, nec eos tamen semper, nec omnes, nec omni modo :† aliorum denique dignitati parcere, in quo ipse servaverit suam.‡ Discat etiam a Quintiliano, "quæ fortia inter dicendum visa fuerint, stulta, cum læserint, vocari." Meminerit quoque et turpem et inhumanam esse ejus voluptatem, qui, risus ut eliceat, "petulans esse sustineat, compositusque ad stomachum audientium, bono a viro in rabulam et latratorem convertatur." Illud autem vel in primis animo infixum habeat, "mores dicentis ex oratione quodammodo agnosci, neque maledicum distare a malefico, nisi occasione."§

Fore probe scio, ut ea mihi objiciantur, quæ de‖ Fimbria scripta sunt: "habitum fuisse cum oratorem asperum ac maledicum, et genere toto paulo fervidiorem: diligentia tamen et virtute animi et vitæ bonum exstitisse auctorem in senatu"—Equidem illud non possum quin fatear, vehementerque doleam, quod fide mâ δεῖνα auditoribus semper faciat, quod ei Populus faveat validissime, et eloquentiam,

---

* Plutarch. Vit. Syll. p. 473. † Cicer. Orator. p. 169.
‡ De Orat. lib. ii. p. 115.
§ Vide Quintil. lib. xii. c. 9. & lib. vi. cap. 2.
‖ Brut. p. 143.

quam semper in * numerato is habeat, ita admiretur, ut, quid in eo reprehendi debeat, nunquam requirat. Quare ita factum esse existimem, si quis curiosius elicere velit, causæ sunt in promtu, nec tacendæ illæ quidem, nec sine cura mihi dicendæ.

Solet profecto vulgus uni alicui totum se dedere atque addicere. Hunc, tanquam amores et delicias suas, complexu et sinu recipit—hujus integritatem et innocentiam summam esse,† jurati testificantur omnes ad unum, licet, opinionis ejus rationem qui reddat, nemo unus reperiatur.

Minime vero fugit τὸν δεῖνα vulgi aures esse quandam ‡ tibiam, in quam oporteat oratorem inflare. Hac de causa, per artes non ante vulgatas, et populo § canit et sibi—quod autem acroama || Themistocles dicebat lubentissime se audire, illud ipsum credit ὁ δεῖνα sua voce optime decantatum, ipse cum se admiretur, suaque de virtute palam et gloriosius prædicet. Hinc, sive de lana rixatur caprina, sive de stillicidiis declamitans παρατραγωδεῖ, et cœlo mare confundit, prima ut sibi fides habeatur, deposcit. Hinc omni, quæ habetur contra voluntatem ejus, oratione graviter offenditur, tanquam, ubi laudis intempestivæ blandimenta desint, ibi semper adsit acerbitas contumeliarum. Hinc, quam magnis unquam et divinis bonis viri præclarissimi consecuti sunt licentiam, eandem ipse se arbitratur consecutum esse, ut contra morem et consuetudinem civilem asper sit in dicendo.

* Quint. lib. vi. cap. 3. et Senec. lib. ii. controv.
† Hudibras, lib. i. line 7. ‡ Brut. p. 147.
§ Ibid. p. 146. || Orat. pro Arch. p. 190.

Per id ridiculum est quod dicturus sum, et portenti simile. Tantum ipse Clodius prædicat in τῷ δεῖνα castitatis splendorem esse, ut oculos etiam suos eo hebetari et præstringi sentiat. Aristippeum igitur illud de voluptate, quæ sensibus nostris blandiatur, contemnere se ait, et experiendo abjecisse. Nihil fatetur esse virtute formosius, nihil pulchrius, nihil amabilius. Unum a se aliquem inventum esse confirmat, qui aspernetur oculis pulchritudinem rerum, qui suavitatem omnem auribus excludat, omnemque vitæ suæ cursum, in labore corporis atque animi contentione conficiat,

—— hic pudicus, hic probus
Perambulabit astra sidus Georgium.*

Sunt ea a Clodio perbelle simulata. Ab aliis interea creditur ὁ δεῖνα "magis † extra vitia esse, quam cum virtutibus." Mihi vero ipsi semper visum est hac in parte moderationem ‡ Fimbriæ et prudentiam sequi. Quamobrem nihil me de moribus τοῦ δεῖνα illo austero more et modo judicaturum dixi, ne aut famam læderem probati hominis, si contra judicassem, aut statuisse viderer virum bonum esse illum, in quo multa officia multasque laudes, quæ hanc ad rem pertinerent, nonnunquam desiderassem. Atque idem ego haud negaverim in Foxio esse nonnulla, quæ lenissimus quisque et facillimus reprehendere possit et subaccusare. At videtur eum tamen ipsa natura finxisse, ad justitiam, ad in-

* Hor. Epod. 17. † Tacit. Hist. i. cap. 49.
‡ Cic. de Offic. lib. iii. p. 526.

dustriam, ad omnes denique amicitiæ virtutes, reïque publicæ rationes, magnum hominem et excelsum.

Etsi de ea virtutis indole, quæ in τῷ δεῖνα inesse dicitur, nihil a me, concertandi causa, proferri debet, illud tamen mihi licere et integrum esse statuo, ut quasi subductis rationibus summam mearum de hac re cogitationum exponam. Huc vero apprime faciunt hæc e Livio desumta verba, et interdum a me, sicubi res postularet mutata. Mihi igitur videtur ὁ δεῖνα, "non veris solum virtutibus aliquantulum ornatus, sed arte quoque quadam ab juventa in ostentationem earum compositus. Quare eorum, quæ de pudicitia ejus et temperantia," et in aspernandis voluptatibus prope quadam immanitate, "vulgo ferebantur, nunquam ab ipso elusa fides est, quin potius aucta consilio quodam, nec abnuendi talia, nec palam affirmandi. Alia in hoc genere vera, alia assimulata, admirationis humanæ in hoc juvene excesserant modum, quibus freta nuper civitas, ætati haudquaquam maturæ, tantam molem rerum permisit."*

A populo, cum se τῷ δεῖνα totum permitteret, læto omnia magis quam prospero successu gesta sunt. Sed non sine usu fuerit introspicere illa primo aspectu levia, e quibus maximi sæpe rerum motus † oriuntur. Suæ igitur oportet felicitati cives nostri illud acceptum referant, minime posse ea, quæ ipsi nuper fecerint, ratione et modo tractari, ut quæ neque consilium in se ullum neque modum habuerint. Res quidem sua, cum nullam præ se ferret

* Liv. lib. xxvi. cap. 19. † Tacitus Annal. iv. par. 32.

effigiem veritatis solidam expressamque, exigebant, (quæ fuit eorum sive calliditas malitiosa sive insulsitas singularis,) exigebant, inquam, rem adversariorum ad ridiculum, si Diis placet, tanquam ad Lydium lapidem. Minime eos crediderimus sapientiæ illius, quam Shaftsburius excolebat, esse consultos. Fuit autem iis monstratum intus, et ab ipsa Natura præpotenti imperatum, ut in quo maxime ipsi valuissent, eo ipso homines se meliores prudentioresque terrerent et vulnerarent. Solet itaque nobis sæpe in mentem venire temporis illius, quo omnes illi, qui rerum momenta non potuissent perpendere, oculos tamen potuissent incertos, atque adeo animos incertiores "pictura pascere * inani." Etenim cum Pericles staret a partibus adversis, fuit illis integrum, aut Pausona nescio quem ad suas vocare, aut Bupalum, aut virum quendam "optimarum† sane artium sed pessimarum partium," cujus nomen Anglicanum, cum ἀπόῤῥητον esset, Στέφανον "Graii vertere vocantes."

Sufficiebant profecto operi cui pares se crediderant. Pictas per tabellas, jocis eas quidem καθημαξευμένοις refertas, illud effecerunt, quod de Cleandro memoratum est. Is enim Præfectum ‡ quendam ob Ægypti administrationem ἐλοιδόρησε κωμωδῶς, καὶ παρέλυσε αὐτὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς οὐδὲν ἀδικήσαντα. Alia autem ex parte non defuerunt, qui Camœnis § minacibus armati in studiosam illam juvenum cohortem

---

* Virg. Æn. i. † Cic. Perorat. pro Cæl.

‡ Æl. Frag. ex emend. Masson. p. 1020. edit. Gron.

§ Rolliad. scriptores.

insurgerent, liberosque Iambos vi et asperitate prorsus Hipponactea, indignabundi distringerent. Fore tamen optandum est, ut ad ultionem potius quam defensionem composita fiat tabula, qualem ferunt, (quoniam Græcas * fabellas enarrare licet,) tum denique ab Apelle esse pictam, cum immerito ipse, Antiphilo † accusante, graviterque rege Ptolomæo irascente, pene obrutus esset infamia. Sin hoc minus fiat, aliud instituendum est opus, plus in se artis habens, neque tamen materiam ipsam superans. His enim in rebus fieri nequit, quin "infamia sit minor vero."‡ Ecquis autem ignorat virum § illum egregium, qui ὁμοτεχνίτων suorum familiam ducit, minime solere in sententiam του δεῖνα pedibus ire? Quin idem jure optimo dicimus de aliis fere omnibus, qui sunt in hac nostra ætate, aut usu rerum, aut ingenii acumine, aut ornamentis artium ingenuarum præ cæteris habiti dictique eximii. His profecto viris causa victa quantum placuerit, dici vix potest. Nec vero superior illa esse desiit, licet inferiorem qui defensitent, plures sint numero, et tanquam "juncto umbone Phalanges" ad depugnandum prodeant parati.

Quæ cum ita sint, quicquid est in repulsa dedecoris facile ferunt ii, in quos convenit illud quod est a Zenone dictum πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Θεοφράστου μαθήτων, ὁ ἐκείνου χόρος (ἔφη) μεῖζων, οὑμὸς δὲ συμφω-

* Liv. lib. xxviii. cap. 44.

† Lucian. de Calumn. non tem. credend. par. 3, 4, & 5. unde profluxerunt pulcherrima illa in Præf. Warburt. in tom. iii. de Div. Legat. Mos. p. 26.

‡ Ov. Met. lib. i. § I. R. Equit.

νότερος.* At studia sunt horum idcirco suis cariora et magis honorifica, quia nec spei nec timori tribuuntur.†

Nihil est sane, cur miremur grassandi in famam fortunasque civium optimorum populo non defuisse voluntatem. Impune in easdem grassandi contigisse multitudini occasionem, id vero ei non invidemus. Legimus enim in Euripide,

> Τῷ πλεόνι γ' αἰεὶ πολέμιον καθιστάναι
> Τοῦ λασσον ————‡

De Argivis etiam nos docuit Isocrates, ὅτι τοὺς ἐνδόξους καὶ πλουσιωτάτους τῶν πολιτῶν αὐτοὶ ἀπολλύουσι, καὶ ταῦτα ὁρῶντες, οὕτω χαίρουσιν, ὡς οὐδένες ἄλλοι τοὺς πολεμίους ἀποκτείναντες.§

Qui autem hæc tam aperte diximus, populi ut de jure disputemus tantum abest, ut ei fateamur liberum esse suffragiis suis, quid cuique velit, vel dare vel detrahere. Atqui eundem plane et obnixe contendimus dignos sæpe negligere—sæpe ea quæ pulcherrime facta sint, fastidire ‖—sæpe eblandita ‖ ejus esse suffragia non enucleata, ut studium in iis ferendis, aut ira appareat, potius quam judicium. Levis profecto si res agatur, sapiens quisque, etiam quæ minus laudaverit, tolerari tamen statuerit oportere. In tempestatibus autem et fluctibus istis quos nuper vidimus, impetu plena omnia et temeritate fuerunt. Sin judicium id quivis maluerit vocare,

---

* Plutarch, tom. ii. p. 545. † Corn. Nep. Att. vit. cap. 6.
‡ Phœn. 552.
§ Orat. Philipp. p. 165. edit. Basil. 1571.
‖ Orat. pro Planc. p. 84.

ejusmodi sane est ut ferri debeat nulla alia de causa, nisi quod penitus rescindi nequeat. Invitus hæc tanquam vulnera attingo. Quæ autem præterita sunt, ni reprehendantur, corrigi et sanari nequeunt. Ea porro omnia, quæ semel * acciderunt, iterum ac tertio accidere possunt, et quod hodie nobis minus in integro est † exemplis tueri, id ipsum inter exempla erit, si forte æmulos ‡ invenerit nequitia plus æquo felix.

Quoties versantur rerum maximarum momenta, prudentissimus quisque existimabit se non tam annumerare debere, quam appendere suffragia. In rumoribus spernendis mentem solidam secum afferet. Elaborabit pro virili, ut optimi cujusque studiosus videatur, potius quam popularis. Faciles commodasque aures præbebit non nisi iis, qui mores hominum intimosque sensus per integumenta verborum et involucra, cognitos habent et probe exploratos. Novit is quidem multa, quæ inter ancipitia probata fuerint, veris mox pretiis § æstimari. Homines novit sæpe temerarios atque imperitos, falsis rumoribus terreri, et de summis rebus consilium capere, et impelli ad facinus. Novit in mutatione Reipublicæ, fieri posse, ut adversariorum res verbosior et magis popularis sit, sua cum sit verior. Novit denique honestas rerum causas || ducere ad exitus perniciosos, si forte populi aliena aut offensa sit voluntas. Hæc ille omnia animo agitans, respi-

---

* Liv. lib. xxviii. cap. 41.
‡ Tacit. Hist. iv. cap. 42.
|| Tacit. Hist. par. 83.
† Tacit. Annal. xi. cap. 24.
§ Annal. xi. par. 26.

ciensque ad istos tumultus populares, dubitabit profecto, utrum pejor res * ipsa sit, an pejori facta sit exemplo. Dolebit interea naturæ humanæ infirmitate tardiora esse remedia quam mala; neque exempla solere, unde cœperint, ibi consistere.

Hæc qui fecerit, in memoriam sibi illud revocabit, quod est a Polybio scriptum: ὁ δῆμος πᾶν καὶ τὸ πλεῖστον αὐτός· οὗ γενομένου, τῶν μὲν ὀνομάτων τὸ κάλλιστον ἡ πολίτεια μεταλήψεται, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν· τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων τὸ χείριστον, τὴν ὀχλοκρατίαν.† Quæ autem gravissimus ille scriptor fieri intellexit cum "mutationis in deterius principium existeret ab honoribus per ambitionem petitis aut negatis," ea nos vidimus facta esse in maximo et pulcherrimo incepto.

Probe scimus esse permulta, quæ dum fiunt, non laudentur, sed cum facta sint, plurimum fructus habeant. Horum in numero ponenda est lex illa, quæ de Rebus Asiaticis a viro quodam præclaro rogata fuit, et a proceribus regni fœdissime antiquata. Equidem haud ignarus sum quam flexibiles sint hominum mentes incertæque: quantum valeant omnes rumorum et concionum venti, quos colligere cives populares consuescunt. Hac de causa, cum facienda sit alicujus rei mutatio, temporum puto rationem habendam esse, populoque esse et scenæ aliqua ex parte serviendum.

Qui autem illud reprehendunt et accusant, cur in re tam inusitata Foxius quidquam novi fecerit, his

* Liv. lib. xxxiv. cap. 2.

† Polyb. Megal. lib. vi. p. 694. edit. Cas.

ego respondendum esse statuo Canuleii verbis. Nullane res nova institui debet, et quæ nondum facta sunt, (multa enim nondum facta sunt in hac nova Asiaticorum civitate) ea, ne si utilia quidem sint, fieri oportet?"*

At enim quo tandem jure lex ea innisa est? Nimirum eo quod Jupiter ipse sanxit, ut omnia quæ salutaria reipublicæ essent, justa et legitima haberentur.† Neque enim nunc primum patriæ salutem aut Brutus aut Cassius legem sanctissimam et morem optimum‡ judicavit. Est autem hominis pudentis cupidique officio satisfaciendi, ut consilium sequatur periculosum, magis, dum se optimo cuique probarit, quam tutum, quod habere possit minus commodi et plus opinionis. Natura quidem ita comparatum est, ut qui apud Multitudinem sua causa loquuntur, gratiosi sint; cum adversis auribus accipiatur, quicquid a sapientibus viris dictum fuerit. Itaque in illa conversione rerum non recusandum fuit, quin magna datetur occasio improbioris famæ. Qui autem contra periculosas hominum Asiaticorum opes et potentiam tunc temporis providebant, eosdem certo scio civium communi et commodo consuluisse et gloriæ. Et vero licet illis dicere cum Claudio,§ nullum factum dictumve suum contra utilitatem publicam, etsi quædam contra voluntatem, referri posse."

Qui verbi invidia contumeliaque maledicti Foxium obruere volunt, ii clamitant majestatis fuisse populi

---

* Lib. lib. iv. cap. 4. † Cic. Philippic. xi. p. 529.
‡ Ibid. § Liv. lib. vi. cap. 40.

Anglicani prohibere injuriam, neque pati cujusquam regnum * per scelus crescere. At regem † ne posthac Foxium dixerint, nisi forte regium iis videtur in Senatu sentire libere: non modo homini nemini, sed ne partibus quidem ullis, fracto animo et demisso servire: populi utilitati magis consulere, quam ad arbitrium ejusdem totum se fingere et accommodare: potentioribus prave consiliantibus non cedere: projectæ eorum et effrænatæ audaciæ fortiter obsistere.

Sed si qui sunt, quibus injuriæ, illi Senatui illatæ, parvi æstimandæ videantur, monendi sunt ii, quod parva ista ‡ non contemnendo, majores nostri hanc rem maximam fecerint.

Non est hujusce loci opiniones eorum excutere, qui pertimescere se dicerent, ne forte prærogativa regia labefactaretur. Sæpe eos putabam, qui tantas de hac re tragœdias excitarent, non tam imprudentia falli, quam invidia aliqua et obtrectatione impediri. Quinetiam argumenta eorum pleraque videbantur nobis lepore potius elevanda, quam frangenda acri contentione, eo quod istiusmodi opiniones jam pridem in hac republica, non solum tenebris vetustatis, verum etiam luce libertatis oppressæ sunt. Sed satis est superque horum cavillatorum sive ratiunculis sive maledictis a Burkio responsum § ea in sententia, quam verbis conceptis et amplissimis dixit de oratione a Rege habita, et cui nihil a viris rei politicæ prudentissimis, neque addi neque demi potest.

---

* Sal. Bel. Jug. cap. 15.
† Cic. Orat. pro Syll. p. 382.
‡ Lib. lib. vi. cap. 41.
§ Die Lunæ, Jun. 14, 1784.

Illam tane Burkii sententiam qui attente diligenterque legerint, ferent id vel acerbissime, quod gravi et intolerabili arrogantia nuper in Senatu nescio quis Wilberforcius balbutivit; quod est voce τοῦ δεῖνα importuna et scelerata iteratum; quod homulorum ei temere assentientium agrestibus et inhumanis auribus exceptum est valde libenter. Ibi tum impudentissima eorum hæc fuerunt verba—deflorescere jam Burkium, et pene ineptire, siquidem, credo, non maneant pristina illa eadem concinnitas, et lactea eadem ubertas, cum eadem non deceant. Atqui oratio ejus, annon * canescere potius videtur, suamque quandam habere maturitatem et quasi senectutem? Ego vero contendere ausim, ita se rem habere; quod quidem cum dico, meminerint isti clamatores, velim, γῆρας † ἐμὲ διηγεῖσθαι, γῆρας δ' ὅμως Ὁμήρου.

Huncine credibile aut memorabile est, ut ὁ δεῖνα uno unquam verbo violaverit? ut hominem omnibus litterarum ornamentis redundantem, is cui, ut levissima dicam, multa desint, spreverit atque irriserit. Profecto hoc, quicquid est, vel petulantiæ, vel audaciæ, animi esse videtur pusilli, et ad rixandum prochivis, et ipsa malevolentia jejuni et inanis.

Quin vos, quotquot estis, qui vacuas τῷ δεῖνα, sed obtusas Burkio aures præbetis, a me nunc demum accipite illud amplum et honorificum ipsius Jonsoni testimonium. Ita enim, crebro nobis, sæpe aliis audientibus, ita, inquimus, gravissimus ille atque acerrimus censor dicebat "in neminem se unquam inci-

* Brut. p. 137. † Longin. Sect. ix.

disse, qui, vel tantam varietatem rerum et copiam, quantam Burkius, memoria consecutus esset, vel oratione tam illuminate, tamque abundanter complexus." Præterea, subridens, ut mos hominis erat, βλοσυροῖσι* προσώπασι, neque ullam in tali amico levitatem, sed ingenium ad omnia versatile significans, illud addere solebat, "ne † τὰς ὑβριαζούσας quidem posse cum Edmundo in triviis aut compitis cædere sermones, quin obstupescerent atque clamarent, οὗτος ἐκεῖνος." Hunccine igitur ut maledictis ultro et impune lacessierint juvenum greges, aut insulse putideque balbutientium, aut latrantium contumeliose et inhumaniter? Non sinam, non patiar, non feram.

Posse nos in vexatissima quæstione aliqua culpa erroris teneri lubentissime confitemur. Causam vero illam, quæ ad rationes Asiæ administrandæ pertinebat, per omnes juris anfractus, omnesque eruendæ veritatis latebras, pro ingenii nostri modulo exploravimus. Neque est quicquam in illa a nobis repertum, quod sit minus recte contrave Rempublicam aut factum aut inchoatum. Felicius necne res Asiæ a τῷ δεῖνα tractentur, ipse viderit. Sua, ipse viderit, consilia fuerint, necne, ejusmodi, primo ut aspectu speciosiora visa sint, cum aliorum essent usu meliora. Quæ autem a nobis probata est lex, fuit eadem neque intellecta minima ex parte, neque oculis strictim aspecta a plerisque eorum, qui acer-

* Iliad, vii. line 212.

† Ælian. Var. Hist. lib. ix. cap. 17. et Cic. Tusc. Quæst. p. 402.

rime de ea sunt conquesti, ejusque in auctores invecti sunt non arrogantia, nam id vulgare vitium est, sed immanitate quadam nova et prorsus inaudita.

Non me præterit quanta sit in Coalitionem, quod aiunt, invidia conflata. "Sed aliud est maledicere, aliud accusare." Hoc vero ipsum munus convicianti, etsi non admiratus sum, sane quam moleste * tuli potissimum esse a τῷ δεῖνα susceptum. Neque enim decebat, neque ætas illa postulabat. Fatendum est autem Juvenis disertissimi eum fuisse pudorem, qui in tali illum oratione versari facillime pateretur Profecto has maledicendi partes nemo ex illis robustioribus, aut libentius arripere potuit, aut liberius, fortiusque, et magis more suo, sustinere.

Nobis sane persuasissimum est, viris illis quos tanquam patruæ linguæ verberibus, et pene Censorii styli mucrone petiverit, nihil fuisse prius antiquiusve, quam ut Respublica ne quid detrimenti caperet. Quin causa eorum materiem satis amplam habet, non modo ad defendendum, verum etiam ad laudandum. Ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς οὐ τοῦτο σκοποῦμεν, τινὶ δεῖ συγγνώμην ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ ὀρθῶς καὶ μὴ ὀρθῶς.†

Nam quod objectum est de Coalitione vocibusque improborum hominum celebratum,‡ id nunquam Foxius et Northius tam acerbe ferent, ut eos pœniteat inimicitias posse deponere. Non putarunt famam inconstantiæ § sibi pertimescendam, si quibus-

* Orat. pro Cæl. par. 2.
† Aristot. de Rep. lib. ii. cap. 9.
‡ Orat. pro Cæl. par. 2.
§ Epist. ad Len. 9.

dam in sententiis paululum se immutassent. Cum perfuncta * esset Respublica misero fatalique bello, non solum quid sibi expediret, sed quid deceret se atque optimum esset, rationis ad normam exegerunt. Belli illius vulnera existimarunt, tum demum sanari posse, si inter diversas civium voluntates distractasque sententias, fieret consensus bonorum omnium conspirans et pene conflatus. Jecerunt, quod in se fuit, fundamenta pacis domesticæ Atheniensiumque † vetus renovarunt exemplum, atque discordiarum memoriam omnem oblivione sempiterna delendam esse censuerunt. Lapsi sunt, non pravitate aliqua, sed opinione officii et specie quadam reipublicæ. Fecerunt, quod ab Æmilio ‡ Lepido et Fulvio Flacco, magna cum laude olim factum fuerat. Hoc unum iis deesse maceror et doleo, quod exempla Themistoclis § et Aristidis sibi ad imitandum non proposuerint, ut respublica eos inter se, bello jam flagrante, conciliare posset et conjungere maturius.

Cum || a clarissimis viris justissimas inimicitias sæpe cum bene meritis civibus depositas esse vidissem, non sum arbitratus quenquam amicum reipublicæ, postea quam Fokii amor in Patriam perspectus esset, novas illi inimicitias, nulla accepta injuria, denuntiaturum. Sed aliter res cecidit, atque opinabar. Etenim τῷ δεῖνα videtur neque ipsi periculosum, nec sordidum ad famam, committere ut accusator nominetur. Suæ insuper dignitatis esse existimat, sum-

---

* Orat. pro Marcell. par. 4. † Philip. i. p. 494.
‡ Val. Max. lib. iv. § Polyæn. lib. i. Στρατ.
|| Orat. pro Flacco, p. 371.

ium ad imperium, in quo versatur, naturæ etiam cerbitatem adjungere. Alii autem cum et tempo-um rationem habuerint, et quidem indolis suæ ad enevolentiam paulo proclivioris, "Scelus tu illud ocas, Tubero?"* Profecto hoc cum facis, petulan-issime te affirmo injustissimeque iis maledicere, ui causam habent, vel, uti ego dixerim, meliorem uam tu, vel uti tu, tuæ dignitatis istos adjutores utoresque circumspiciens, ipse, necesse est, fatearis, arem. Debet, mehercule, causa illa nomine hoc tro atque horribili, te quidem certe auctore, penitus acare. Num quid subtimes, crimen hoc deponen-arum inimicitiarum, ne ad te pertinere videatur? sto libera te metu. Nemo credet unquam tantam i te esse aut humanitatem aut animi magnitudi-em. Non est tuum ira atque odio cohibendo de epublica bene † mereri. Auctoritati vero tuæ on est idcirco parendum, quia adversariis tuis op-osuisti sanctissimum illud nomen Regis. Te enim ociosque tuos, qui intus et in cute norunt, verbo-um pondus tuorum facile sustinebunt. Ad istos um respiciunt, liquido patebit inter tam diversas ientes, inter studia tam contraria, tamque pugnan-es inter se cupiditates, nullam posse concordiam sse, quæ sincera ac diuturna sit. Latebras, quæ uo in animo sunt, si excutiunt et explorant, "im-une quælibet facere, id demum judicabunt, Regem sse."‡

* Pro Ligario, par. iv. † Philippic ii. par. 6.
‡ Sall. Bell. Jugurth. par. 86.

Qui ex errore multitudinis imperitæ, et insipientium sermone omnino pendet, hic in viris magnis non habendus est. Nihil * enim ipsi potest esse certi,—nihil, quod exploratum habeat permansurum sibi unum annum. Aliter sentiunt illi qui tanquam ψάφωνος † ὄρνιθες, stabile quiddam, et fixum, et proprium esse fortunam τοῦ δεῖνα arbitrantur. Sed mecum ii recognoscant, velim, quo in statu res nostræ sitæ esse videantur, et quæ sint civium diversorum diversæ in eum voluntates.

Si aut obsurdescunt cives saniores, aut paulo fastidiosius subringuntur ad nomen tributi, adest nescio quis e publicolis istis et τοῦ δεῖνα assentatoribus, qui populum miris lenociniis permulceat et titillet. Argumenta ejus, quibus φενακίζει ἡλᾶς, huc fere redeunt.

Μὴ περιλαλῶμεν, μηδὲ πυνθανώμεθα
Τί ποτ' ἄρα δρᾶν μέλλουσιν, ἀλλ' ἁπλῷ τρόπῳ
Εὖμεν ἄρχειν, σκεψάμενοι ταυτὶ μόνα,
Ὡς τοὺς στρατιώτας, βασίλεως ὄντες φίλοι,
Σώζειν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν.———
Τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐάσω· ταῦτα κᾆν πείθησθέ μοι,
Εὐδαιμονοῦντες, τὸν βιὸν διάξετε.‡

Scilicet, qui ad calculos omnia exigue et exiliter revocant, sua in divendita et addicta sententia non erubescunt perseverare. Alii tanquam sacramento obligati aut superstitione quadam constricti, de consilio, quod susceperint, discedere nefas esse ducunt.

---

* Cic. de Off. lib. i. p. 501.

† Mich. Apostol. Prov. edit. Heins. p. 266.

‡ Aristoph. Eccles. lin. 230 and 239.

Quibus olim est persuasum, ubi * pars civium esset, ibi imperii esse partem, illi ipsi in † contumeliam ignominiamque certant suam, cum ‡ crescere sibi aiunt ex eo ipso fiduciam, quod possit in Juvenis unius virtute tantum esse momenti. Impetus autem multorum resederunt, non negligentia, sed quodam consilio, si quidem fatentur se, quos fugiant, habere; quos sequantur, non habere.

Πόλιν γὰρ ὁρῶσι προστάταισι χρωμένην
Ἀεὶ πονηροῖς· κἄν τις ἡμέραν μίαν
Χρηστὸς γένηται, δέκα πονηρὸς γίγνεται.
Ἐπέτρεψας ἑτέρῳ; πλείον' ἔτι δράσει κακά.§

Transferunt alii ad τὸν δεῖνα, quod Tacitus de Galba || scripsit; "fuisse illum omnium consensu capacem imperii, nisi imperasset." Aliorum in mentibus, cum illa dicendi vitiosa jactatio suos inter plausores detonuit, tandem aliquando videtur resurgere veræ spretæque virtutis fortior fama.¶ Etenim quæ et facta sunt a τῷ δεῖνα et dicta in eadem trutina illi perpendunt, cognitumque jam artificem, aliquandoque evolutum illis integumentis dissimulationis suæ, nudatumque perspiciunt.

Mirantur profecto et stomachantur proceres sibi necesse esse tam anguste sedere inter homines, qui, nulla vel famæ vel majorum commendatione, ad honores obrepserint. Per silentium vero aut ⸸ occultum murmur optimus quisque Senator excipit quos-

* Liv. lib. viii. cap. 4.
† Lib. iv. cap. 4.
‡ Liv. xxviii. cap. 43.
§ Aristoph. Eccles. line 176.
|| Hist. lib. i. par. 49.
¶ Quintil. lib. xii. cap. 9.
⸸ Tacit. Annal. ii. cap. xxxviii.

dam suum in ordinem popularibus suffragiis nuper allectos, idque non injuria. Sunt enim, magnam partem, aut prædones Asiæ opibus superbientes, aut viri loco infimo nati et in omni civili ratione hospites ac tirones, quibus sane edicto opus est hujuscemodi, "Bonum * Factum! Senatori novo obviam euntes curiam monstranto." Dolent interea qui res ponderant certo judicio, iidemque indignantur, adolescentibus loquacioribus esse serviendum, et omnes, qui videantur scire aliquid, tanquam dominos timeri. Veniunt quippe illis in mentem ea quæ Ephesii, cum civitate expulissent Hermodorum, locuti sunt, "nemo de nobis unus excellat: sin quis exstiterit, alio in loco, et apud alios vivat."†

Ad summum, fateri non reformidant, civitatis suæ saluti ipsum Allantopolam tum denique prospexisse, cum vetaret ne in foro, aut in republica gerenda ἀγένειοι versarentur.

Τὰ μειράκια ταυτὶ λέγω
Ἃ στωμυλεῖται τοιαδὶ καθήμενα·
Σοθὸς γ' ὁ δεῖνα, δεξιῶς τ' οὐκ ἀπεθάνε·
Ξυνερκτικὸς γάρ ἐστι, καὶ περαντικὸς,
Καὶ γνωμοτυπικὸς, καὶ σαφὴς, καὶ κρουστικὸς.‡

Civium de maxima parte notissimum est, eos rumoribus atque auditionibus permotos, de summis sæpe rebus consilia inire, quorum eos e vestigio pœnitere necesse sit: quum incertis rumoribus serviant, et plerique ad voluntatem eorum ficta respon-

* Sueton. vit. J. Cæs. par. 80.
† Cic. Tusc. lib. v. p. 240. ‡ Aristoph. Equ. 1372.

leant. Inde fit, ut nihil sit illorum studiis incertius ut obscurius, totamque eorundem opinionem parva ionnunquam commutet aura rumoris.* Etenim ion modo ipsi quid facturi sint, minus diligenter auteque perpendunt, sed ne tum quidem, cum fuerit actum, quare ita factum sit intelligere possunt. taque omnes illi, qui contagione nuper insanie- ant, ne hodie quidem scire videntur, quo amentiæ psi progressi sint. Qui autem pluris hominum amam quam Rempublicam faciunt, levi quovis mo- nento huc et illuc impelluntur. Sed ea est horum iominum ratio, ut, quo lenius † primo agant, seg- iusque odisse incipiant, eo, cum cœperint, perse- erantius sæviant. His de causis perbreve quid- am et ventosum videtur extraordinarium illud Im- erium, quod est τῷ δεῖνα haud ita pridem com- nissum. Quare caveat necesse est, ne, quantulum it id, quod humeri ejus ferre non recusent, sæpius equo ostendat, cum res gravissimas minus cogitate ggrediatur. Caveat ne adolescens improvida ætate ta se erratis fraudibusque irretiat, ut salvus esse ion possit, si sanus esse ‡ cœperit. Caveat ne quando ἀποβάλων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν cum Demetrio coga- tur Æschyleum illud usurpare.

Σύ τοι μ' ἔφυσας, σὺ δέ με καταφθίειν δοκεῖς. §

At illud nobis ὁ δεῖνα objiciet, || honorem esse

* Pro Muræn. par. 9. † Liv. lib. xli. cap. 10.
‡ Cicer. Tuscul. Quæst. lib. v. p. 398.
§ Vid. Plutarch. de Monarch. et Æschyli fragm. ex emend. Heathii. || Brut. p. 152.

præmium virtutis, judicio studioque civium ad aliquem delatum, quod si quis sententiis eorum ac suffragiis adeptus fuerit, eum sibi et honestum et honoratum merito videri. Hæc autem ne vera esse credam, prohibent ea, quæ a Quinto Cicerone dicta sunt, cum* propter tot tantos tamque præcipites casus clarissimorum hominum, Marcum fratrem ab omni contentione ac dimicatione revocaret. Prohibent pessimorum virorum dignitates, qui occasione aliqua, etiam volentibus suis civibus, nacti sunt imperium. Prohibent, pleni ea de re argumentis libri, plenæ sapientium voces, plena exemplorum vetustas.

De bello Americano, acerbissime multi conqueruntur. At vitia ejus modique unde fluxerint, illud vero eos habet parum sollicitos. Nimium de re gravissima dicunt, nec tamen totum. In unum e multis belli ejus auctoribus, quicquid in buccam venerit, temere iracundeque effutiunt. Quod quidem sibi si liceat impune facere, satis ipsi sibi videntur, quid clamitando possent, ostendisse, et civium satisfecisse officio bonorum. Aliis plurimum terroris injecit regia illa potestas, quæ in præmiis et honoribus pessimo cuique deferendis, nimia esse dicitur et tantum non prodiga. Sed causas rerum earum, quæ nuper acciderint, ipse cum requiro quæ verisimillimæ sint, alio ex fonte mihi videtur, quicquid est malorum, in patriam esse derivatum. Est enim hominum quoddam genus, qui primos se

* De Orator. lib. iii. p. 124.

rerum omnium videri nolunt et tamen sunt. * Quod si dominandi libido tam effrænata τὸν δεῖνα tenet: si "Iulus ille noster" quærit impensius, "Unde suo partus Marte triumphus eat," † hostes ei, quos republica incolumi superet, cohors Aulica cumulatissime præbebit—quare præmia si cupit ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ πάτραγαθίας ‡ reportare, oro illum obtestorque, ut omnes iræ aculeos in istos insidiatores dirigat—hastas, velim, oratoriis viribus lacertisque non amentatas torqueat in θηρία, quæ, si parti ejus credendum est, delitescunt, et quidem jamdiu delitescunt, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ ἐν κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου γέμοντα ὀφθάλμων, ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν." §

Mancam ac debilem esse rempublicam, non is sum qui pernegem. At contenderim tamen non ita multos esse, qui medicas ei manus adhibere debeant. Quare consiliorum, quibus ea jamdudum geritur, paulo altius repetenda est ratio; exponendumque quid potissimum agant aut agere velint ii, quibus, vel intercesserit olim cum τῷ δεῖνα amicitia, vel etiam nunc intercedat.

De his autem mihi cogitanti primum ante oculos obversatur vir ille nobilis, cujus sub auspiciis omnia quæ commota fuerant, pace atque otio resederunt, cujusque mira est, qua stat a promissis, constantia et fides. Ἐπεκλήθη γὰρ Δώσων, ὡς ἐπαγγελτικὸς μὲν, οὐ τελεσιουργος δὲ τῶν ὑποσχεσέων. || Sunt qui credant hunc virum fere primam fuisse mali originem,

* Terent. Eunuch. act ii. sc. 2. † Ov. Epist. Did.
‡ Plutarch. de Vitios. Pud. p. 534. & Apophtheg. p. 183.
§ Revelat. cap. iv. et Orat. Comitis de C——m.
|| Plutarch. in Vit. Coriol. p. 218. & Paul. Æmilii 258.

geminasque inter partes, (id quod de Rufino * dicitur,) discordiam, hoc auctore exstitisse. Calculum illis, qui ita judicant ut meum adjiciam, hæc potissimum me impellunt.

Qui consilium in ipso negotio capere coguntur, modice solent titubanterque agere. Dosoni autem ita sunt meditata et provisa fere omnia, ita est ipse totus fallaciis conflatus, ita ad insidiandum nocendumque συγκεκροτημένος,† ut, res si qua præter spem et opinionem acciderit, ea, quid postulet, intelligere et e vestigio aggredi possit. Idoneum, quo hoc faciat, auctorem habet: legerat quippe in Livio,‡ boni ducis esse, non deesse fortunæ præbenti se, et oblato casu flectere ad consilium.

Honoribus sibi inhianti, et primarium semper petenti locum, impedimento novit esse mitem illam Lælii § sapientiam, quæ ad salutem patriæ peroffi-ciose et peramanter incumbens, benevolentiam et charitatem omnium sibi adjunxisset. Itaque adeo, cum vir ille amabilis morte esse exstinctus, fore Doson credebat, ipse ut in campo puro ac patenti versari posset. Pectus continuo illud suum fecundum concussit totum. Statuit aut dolos præclaro cum successu versare, aut in certam incurrere perniciem. Expulsis igitur omnibus, qui aut consilia ejus rimari possent, aut ambitioni vellent acriter resistere, socium sibi in republica procuranda τὸν δεῖνα adjunxit.

---

* Claudian. in. Eutrop. lib. ii.

† Demosth. Olynth. I. et Theocr. Idyll. 15.

‡ Lib. xxviii. cap. 44. § M. de R——m.

Imperii autem inter consortes rarissima est fides, siquidem, quæ amicitias hujusmodi conglutinat utilitas,* eadem, temporibus paululum mutatis, aut dissuit illas aut plane disrumpit. Doson non modo ipe sed ipsa potentiæ et honorum possessione deturbatus est. Paucis post mensibus, monitore illo atque adjutore, summam dignitatem ὁ δεῖνα occupavit. Per quem autem virum, ipse, cum in Senatu propter pubertatem † minime posset, gratia olim creverat, ejus ad potentiam minuendam opibus nervisque omnibus ὁ δεῖνα usus est. Scilicet in secundis Doson voluit ita consistere ut primo ‡ esset proprior quam tertio. Sed repulit illum atque illiberaliter aspernatus est Juvenis, qui "ferre quenquam potest nec priorem nec parem."§ Quid ergo? fortunæ ait Doson minime se invidere et virtuti C. Syllæ, qui jactaverit inter amicos sibi in fatis fuisse γέροντι παῖδων ἀγῶνας ἀγωνίζεσθαι.‖ Veterem illum nunc demum præ se fert morem officii, non infuscatum malevolentia, non assuetum mendaciis, non eruditum artificio simulationis vel suburbano vel etiam ¶ urbano. Otia dicit sese inglorium amare, "Sylvasque,** et vitam quæ fallere sit nescia."†† In urbe mussitat, potius quam ruri posse jam ab aliis secretum illud iter reperiri.‡‡ Qui autem boni §§ viri (ita enim est ille a quodam honorifice dictus in Se-

* Cic. de Amic. p. 544. † Cæs. de Bell. G. l. 4. par. 20.
‡ Quintil. x. cap. 1. § Lucan. lib. i.
‖ Plutarch. Vit. Pompeii, p. 625.
¶ Orat. pro Planc. p. 119. ** Vid. Orat. M. de L.
†† Virg. Georg. i. ‡‡ Horat. Epist. 18. lib. i.
§§ Hor. Ep. 16. lib. 1.

natu) officiis fungitur, is ne malus sit civis, prohibent multa, quo minus vereamur.

Minas possumus contemnere vocemque fulmineam Thrasonici istius oratoris τοῦ τὰς ὀφρῦς κυανέας ἐπηρκότος,* cujus vultum, uti Noviorum † istius minoris, ferre posse se negat quadruplatorum genus omne et subscriptorum. Quid enim? truculentus ‡ semper incedit, teterque, et terribilis aspectu. De supercilio autem isto quid dicendum est? annon reipublicæ illud quasi pignus quoddam videtur? annon senatus illo, tanquam Atlante cœlum, innititur?

Quod si verum est omnes regendæ civitatis rationes, omnia ipsius τοῦ δεῖνα præclara studia, omnem omnium virorum Politicorum laudem atque industriam latere in tutela ac præsidio hujusce unius hominis, vero verius est quod ab Epicharmo dicitur,

ἐκ παντὸς ξυλοῦ
Κίων γένηται.§

Profecto non desunt qui Novium existiment in "summa feritate esse versutissimum, promtumque ingenio ultra Barbarum."‖ Quod si demseris illi aut σφοδρότητα quanta in Bruto fuit, aut πικρότητα vere Menippeam, aut προσώπου σκυθρότητα propriam et suam, facile ejus vel prudentiæ vel fidei juris nodos legumque ænigmata ad solvendum permiseris.

Est quædam, inter laudes Phocionis, et Novii fortunam, similitudo, quatenus uterque, cum esset

---

* Lucian, tom. i. p. 367. † Horat. Sat. ix. lib. i.
‡ Orat. pro Sext. § Epicharmus ἐν Τρῶσι.
‖ Vell. Paterc. lib. ii. cap. 181.

τραχὺς καὶ σκυθρωπὸς, ἐκτήσατο τὴν τοῦ χρηστοῦ προσηγορίαν. "At Phocion * inimicum ex civibus neminem afflixit, ac ne pro inimico quidem habuit, sed quantum res postulabat: tantum ut adversus obsistentes suis pro bono publico actionibus luctaretur, horridus erat, pertinax, et implacabilis. Omnibus in cæteris placidum se communemque et humanum præbebat, lapsisque ferebat opem, atque periclitantibus advocatus aderat adversariis." Hisce a moribus Phocionis quantum Novii vita abhorreat, nihil attinet disputare. Sed quod contumeliose et maledice aiunt futurum, ut Asiæ cujusdam Præfecti dolos, nequi castigare, ultra quam summum jus postulet, neque audire studeat, id sane, quamvis incredibile esse statuerem, Phocionis tamen auctoritate atque exemplo tueri possem, ἐγκαλούντων γὰρ τῶν φίλων ὅτι πονηρῷ τινι κοινομένῳ συνεῖπεν, τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἔφη μὴ δεῖσθαι βοηθείας.†

‡Fervido quodam et petulanti genere dicendi utitur, eodemque, nec valde nitenti, nec plane horrido. Solutos irridentium cachinnos ita commovet, ut lepores ejus, scurriles et prorsus veteratorios diceres. Omnia loquitur verborum sane bonorum cursu quodam incitato, itemque voce, qua ne subsellia quidem ipsa desiderant pleniorem et grandiorem. In adversariis autem lacerandis ita causidicorum § figuras jaculatur, ita callida et malitiosa juris interpretatione utitur, ita furere et bacchari solet, ut sæpe mirere tam alias res agere optimates, ut sit pene insano inter disertos locus.

---

* Plut. in Vit. Phocion. p. 746. † Ibid.

‡ Brut. p. 142. § Sueton. lib. viii. cap. 13.

Fuit * ei, perinde atque aliis, fortuna pro virtutibus. Didicit autem a Muciano, satis clarum esse apud timentem, quisquis † timeatur. Corpore ‡ ipse ingens, animi immodicus, verbis magnificus, et specie inanium magis quam sapientia validus, studia ad se optimatium illexit, § eamque adeptus est auctoritatem, quæ homini novo pro facundia esse posset. Scilicet, quæ bonis Titio, || Seioque turpissima forent, Novium nostrum maxime decent, siquidem e subselliis elapsus de Tribunali nunc pronuntiet, et ex præcone actionum factus sit institor eloquentiæ senatoriæ. Quam igitur in civitate gratiam dicendi facultate Q. Varius ¶ consecutus est, vastus homo atque fœdus, eandem Novius intelligit, illa ipsa facultate, quamcunque habet, se esse in Senatu consecutum—

" Ellum, confidens, catus:
Cum faciem videas, videtur esse quantivis pretî:
Tristis severitas inest in voltu, atque in verbis ** fides."

Arrogantia in dicendo et acerbitas, habent illæ quidem nonnunquam gravitatem. Qui autem tetricum quiddam et vultuosum nunquam non consectatur: qui rem quamque justissimam vel acutulis impedit conclusionibus, vel attenuat affligitque improbulis fallaciis: qui adversarios semper conatur conviciando atque obstrependo verberare et frangere, is sane et in litigiosorum grege et sophistarum, annumerari debet. Verba hæc, quid velint, itemque

* Tacit. Hist. ii. cap. 82.
† Hist. ii. cap. 76.
‡ Annal. 12. cap. 8.
§ Tacit. Hist. cap. 53.
|| Juvenal. Sat. 4.
¶ Cic. de Orat. lib. i. p. 94.
** Ter. And. act v. sc. 2.

alterum ab altero, quantum intersit, melius ipse ab Aristotele, quam a nobis audierit——*ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἐν ἀγῶνι ἀδικία εἰδός τι ἔχει, καὶ ἔστιν ἀδικομαχία τις· οὕτως ἡ ἐναντιολογία, ἀδικομαχία ἔστιν ἐριστική——Οἱ μὲν οὖν τῆς νίκης αὐτῆς χάριν τοιοῦτοι, ἐριστικοὶ ἄνθρωποι καὶ φιλέριδες δοκοῦσιν εἶναι· οἱ δὲ δόξης χάριν τῆς εἰς χρηματισμὸν, σοφισταί.**

At meam de se opinionem si legat Novius, etiam atque etiam illum hortor

Μή μοι γοργείην κεφαλὴν δεινοῖο πελώρου

intorqueat.† Quod in alios sæpe usurpat, triste atque asperum dicendi genus, illud ipsum, credo, maxime exhorrescet in se intentatum.

> " Sed si quid " dictum in se inclementius
> Existimarit esse, sic existimet: sciat
> Responsum, non dictum esse, quia ‡ læsit prior."

In iis, quæ sequuntur, telis ego Novium secundis § petam; imo vero ad hilaritatem illam et suavitatem, qua prope jam delectantur homines, me convertam.

Brevi fore spero, ut vigiliis senioque confectus, curas super urbe civiles libentissime deponat, satisque habeat sibi licere,

> *——Ἐν εἰρήνῃ γε διάγειν τὸν βίον*
> *Ἔχονθ' ἑταῖραν.*‖

Senilem vero amorem si quis putat subturpe quid-

---

* Aristot. Soph. Elench. lib. i. cap. 11.
† Lib. ix. ep. 6. Att. ‡ Ter. prol. Eunuc.
§ Ovid. Met. lib. iii. l. 307. ‖ Aristoph. Pax 438.

dam esse, et tanto vitæ splendori labeculam aspergere, " est ille quidem valde * severus." Latine non accusatorie dico, potuisse Novium satis spectatum probatumque civem videri, si in omni ejus vita nihil esset magis inhonestum, quam quod cum ancillula " senex miles" divortium non fecisset.†

Qui autem prima jam inde ab adolescentia, et forensibus concertationibus et quidem bellis ‡ nocturnis, non sine gloria militavit, eundem credibile est, accedente jam senecta, meliorem posse lenioremque fieri. Satietate abjecisse videbitur, quicquid in se corrigendum, aut § leviter inflectendum sit. Quod dixerit, interdum, si ita rectius sit, mutabit. De sententia decedet aliquando. Exorari se et placari nonnunquam patietur. Alienum a dignitate sua non putabit, cum offensiones, ut semper fecit, æquabilitate decernendi vitare, tum etiam benevolentiam velle adjungere lenitate audiendi.‖ Quibus horribilia ista nunc minitatur, levius cum iisdem et urbanius aget verbis hisce Aristophaneis,

> Ουκέτ' ἄν μ' εὕροις δικαστὴν δριμὺν, οὐδὲ δύσκολον,
> Οὐδὲ τοὺς τρόπους γε δήπου σκληρὸν, ὥσπερ καὶ πρωτοῦ·
> Ἀλλ' ἀπαλόν γ' ἄν μ' ἴδοις,
> Καὶ πολὺ νεώτερον, ἀ-
> παλλάγεντα πραγμάτων.¶

Parum nos movet ἡ πολυπραγμοσύνη nobilis cujusdam viri, cujus ego nomen sciens prætereo, ne opus tendam ultra legem, qua, ne quis Magnatibus flagi-

---

* Orat. pro Cæl.
† Philip. ii. par. 10.
‡ Æn. xi. 736.
§ Orat. pro Muræn. par. 12.
‖ Pro Muræn. p. 366.
¶ Aristoph. Pax 348.

tium faceret contumeliamve, prudentissime cautum est. Signis erit perfacile hominem describere, qui odio possit vincere regem,* sermonisque adeo amari sit, ut nec civium nec Ducum ullorum unquam famæ pepercerit. Themistoclem is cum oderit, Aristidem tamen non amat. Quamquam justum ipse se neque esse neque videri plus nimio cupit, ita tamen est propositi tenax, atque αὐθάδης, ut ne Pythium quidem oraculum de ligneis muris possit eum a machinis et deliramentis suis unquam deflectere aut divellere—At vero arrogantiæ ille per omnem vitæ cursum tantam speciem præbuit, tantamque in publicis muneribus pertinaciæ habet opinionem, ut ineptiæ ejus atque imperia, ne iis quidem, qui ipso amico usi sint, diu perferanda videantur.

Quid tandem est, cur se tantopere jactaret, suamque illam intempestivam molestamque diligentiam ostentaret enumerando τὰς ἐπάλξεις ἂς κονιᾶσθαι ἔφη δεῖν, καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτων καταλόγους οὓς ἐπεσκεύαξε, καὶ τοὺς περὶ χρημάτων λογίσμους καὶ λήρους.†

In rumoribus quidem sane illis, qui famam τοῦ δεῖνα perstringunt, habet populus Anglicanus aures hebetiores. Sed oculi sunt ejus acres et acuti in consiliis dispiciendis, quæ Miso-Themistocli unice sunt cordi. Id adeo malum, quod ex magnis et parum fructuosis expensis nascitur, apud Anglos non minus quam Athenienses in proverbium abiit—τὸ Ἱππάρχου τείχιον.‡

---

* Horat. lib. i. Sat. vii. † Demosth. Olynth. ii.

‡ Mich. Apostol. Parœm. p. 240.

Ne Clodii quidem ipsius mendacia, quæ regibus quondam esse formidini solebant, risum jam aut admurmurationem auditoribus eliciunt, quippe quæ iterum et sæpius conflata sunt usque ad tunicati popelli fastidium.

Quatuor hosce viros, h. e. Dosona, Novium, Miso, Themistoclem, et Clodium, dixi quare non ita vehementer reformidandos esse statuerim. Verum enimvero qui cuniculis et ambagibus et susurris moliuntur omnia; qui in ipsis penetralibus imperii nidulos sibi ponunt, tanquam speculatores miseriarum omnium et discordiarum: qui consilia sua huc atque illuc torquent et flectunt ad tempus: qui rempublicam aut infirmam labefactant, aut validam vigentemque arrodunt: qui juvenes in pulverem et Solem, umbratili ex vita proripientes sese tollunt in altum, ut lapsu eosdem graviori præcipites agant: EORUM profecto ab insidiis nihil non extimesco.

Non sum nescius a quibusdam solere dici hosce βασίλεων οφθάλμους καὶ ὦτα, καὶ χεῖρας, καὶ πόδας* partes τοῦ δεῖνα deseruisse. Vellem profecto ita se res haberet: at non deseruerunt—at Juvenes illos, qui amicitiæ aut dignitatis causa τῷ δεῖνα favebant, sibi, quasi cupiditatum suarum ministros, vel potestatis suæ satellites adjunxerunt—at modo in speculis atque insidiis, ut olim relicti, modo in aciem educti, in capite atque in cervicibus nostris restiterunt. At quos integros cives, et viros fortes et cum

* Vid. Xenoph. Cyrop. lib. viii. et Aristot. de Repub. lib. iii. cap. 16.

reipublicæ salute, natura et fortuna * conjunctos esse intelligunt, eosdem volunt de custodia civitatis cum regiis inimicitiis, tum popularibus suffragiis dejici et deturbari.

Eccum tibi Thrasybulum † istum ἀνδρὰ τρισκαιδεκάπηχυν,‡ cujus vultum habitumque si spectas, erit tibi ad jocandum satis bella materies. Dicendi autem genus quale sit, si quæris, nihil ei inest limatum politumque, nihil sine asperitate et offensione, nihil non incisum angulis aut anfractibus contortum. His accedit lingua volubilis, ferreum os, atque importunum; vox denique, quæ vereor ut perinde intelligi legendo possit, atque ego ipse eam exaudiverim. Sonat illa quidem, ipsa natura, subraucum quiddam et subagreste. Faucibus modo strangulatur tumentibus, modo rasis asperatur.§ In summa laterum nunquam defatigatorum contentione non solum concitata fit, feriensque aera et aures duriter dilacerans, sed fracta identidem, et elisa, et in κλῶσμον subito erumpens. Vitium esse quoddam dicit Tullius, quod nonnulli de industria consectentur, rustica ut vox sit, atque antiquitatem sonet.|| At eam, quæ extra modum absona atque absurda esset, neminem vidi, Thrasybulo excepto, qui non aut effugere cuperet, aut exquisitis remediis dissimulare conaretur et tanquam liquido ¶ plasmate emollire.

Thrasybulum qui viderit ad partes modo has,

---

* Orat. pro Muræn. p. 362. † Ep. 3. lib. viii. ad Att.
‡ Theocr. Id. 15. § Quintil. lib. xi. cap. 3.
|| De Oratore, lib. iii. p. 125. ¶ Pers. Sat. 1.

modo illas, sese convertentem, οὐκ ἂν γνοίης ποτέρωσε μετε η.* Nempe verissimum ei et apprime utile Memmianum illud videtur præstare in republica beneficii † quam maleficii esse immemorem." At quod tandem maleficium potest unquam fieri in illum, cujus voluntatem solet potentior quisque aut impellere quo velit, aut, unde velit, deducere? Thrasybulo igitur salva res est, eo quod non erubuit.‡

Nonnullos ait Tullius "se vidisse, qui, oratores evadere cum non possent, juris ad studium devenissent."§ Thrasybulus autem noster hancce urbanam ad vitam et actuosam accessit, longe aliter subducta ratione. Nec vero mirandum est, novum sibi eum invenisse aucupium, cum egregius magister artis ingeniique largitor sit venter. Domi illi quamdiu habitabat, ima ad subsellia detrusus est, habitusque etiam a vulgo, non solum horridus incultusque Orator, sed infans et pene insipiens. Profecto in dicendo quid posset, ne || judices quidem satis attendebant, siquidem pulchre nossent illum in clamando esse robustum et bene exercitatum. Hoc igitur unum deficit prosperam ejus ad fortunam, quod, duæ cum res, quo magis in foro diceret, confidentia ¶ et vox non deessent, male tamen ei res cesserunt. At vero, quem populares sui existimabant Leguleium, Blateronemque, et syllabarum Aucupem,

---

* Il. v. l. 85. † Sall. Bell. Jug. par. 36.
‡ Terent. Adelph. act iv. sc. 5. § Orat. pro Lege Manil.
|| Divinat. in Cæcil. par. 12.
¶ Nonius. in fragm. Ciceron.

et formularum Cautorem merum; ei in fatis fuit, ut cum dissertissimis hominibus et ad dicendum paratissimis, pugnaret olim decertaretque.

Solum utique cum vertisset, (id quod sæpe factum est ab iis, qui aliquam vel pœnam vel calamitatem subterfugere volunt,) aliam ingressus est viam. Legerat, credo, moris fuisse Germanis, jumenta * quæ viderentur apud se prava atque deformia, hæc, quotidiana exercitatione, summi ut essent laboris, efficere. Curavit itaque ὑποζυγιώδης ἄνθρωπος † ut in se conspicerentur, cum fortitudo ea, quæ esset considerata periculorum susceptio, tum ea patientia, quæ rerum difficilium voluntaria et diuturna perpessione constaret.‡ Merita fore sua credebat magis expressa atque illustriora, si palam profiteretur neminem in se uspiam reperturum esse, aut segnitiem arduis in negotiis, aut in iis quæ subturpicula et subodiosa essent, fastidium nimis delicatum. Omnibus igitur omnia § annuens, potentiorum ad gratiam sensim arrepsit. Militiam || mox Senatoriam, sollicitudinis illam et stomachi plenissimam, secutus est. Semper habuit ὡς ἐν ὑγρῷ γλῶτταν.¶ Commoda enumeravit pacis, opum, potentiæ, pecuniæ, vectigalium, militum, quorum quidem omnium utilitates suo ipsius fructu metitus est. Multorum, salva dignitate sua qualicunque, arro-

* Cæsar de Bell. Gall. lib. iii.
† Mich. Apost. Cent. p. 249.
‡ Cicer. de Inventione, lib. ii. p. 88.
§ Catull. Epith. Jul. et Manl. || Orat. pro Muræn. par. 5.
¶ Theophras. p. 25. edit. Cas.

gantiam pertulit, difficultatem exsorbuit; imo dixit omnia fecitque ad arbitrium aliorum. Invicto hoc labore et pene improbo cum potissimum inniteretur, paulo latius dimanabat ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου * κλέος σοβαρώτατον. Suadere † Principibus quid oporteat, multi laboris rem esse, expertus confirmat. Omnia vero ‡ eorum laudare honesta atque inhoneata, id demum sibi moris esse, id e re sua, id pene ex officio confitetur. Verbis itaque suis nomen aliquod speciosum non prætexit. Palam et aperte cum Marco Terentio loquitur,§ "non est nostrum æstimare quem supra cæteros et quibus de causis extollas. Tibi summum rerum judicium Dii dedere: nobis obsequii gloria relicta est."

Dulci jam ebrius fortuna inter principes artium primarum, nomen profitetur suum. Liceat modo sibi repulsam effugere et rauduſculum || contrectare, velle se ait quidvis et facere et pati. Quin eo usque levitatis progressus est, ut magni nominis in umbra delitescere se existimet, quoties Ciceronis verba, ab animo ea quidem Ciceronis haud parce detorta, propositis suis prætendat, tutasque ad aures obganniat, Sese non semper idem dicere, sed idem semper spectare.¶

Hisce suis virtutibus quasi fastigium quoddam imponens, præceptum illud, quod e cœlo ** descenderat, probe se tenere et religiose servare jactat,

---

* Ælian. Fragm.
† Tacit. Hist. i. cap. 15.
‡ Annal. ii. cap. 38.
§ Annal. l. vi. cap. 8.
|| Epist. ad Att. 8. lib. vi.
¶ Tull. Epist. Fam. l. i. 9.
** Juven. Sat. 11. lin. 27.

auctius illud quidem et longe emendatius, quam e Pythio oraculo quondam profluxisset,

> *Γίγνωσκε σαυτὸν, καὶ μεθάρμοσαι τρόπους* *
> *νέους· Νέος γὰρ καὶ τύραννος.*

Hæc qui facit, is, mihi crede, intelligit se, suis quod probabile gratumque sit, esse facturum; neque enim, cum opiniones maxime inter se discordantes complectitur, non constat sibi. Prius nempe ei cariusque nihil est, quam ut Persona, quam sustineat, ab incepto ad imum eadem procedat: ita tamen, ut rebus ipsis mutatis, sua semper penitusque mutentur consilia, atque *ὁμαλῶς* illud *ἀνώμαλον* lepidissime servetur.†

Fortuna quid possit, quoties in hominibus omnia audacissime incipientibus velit jocari, Thrasybulus iste exploratum habet—illud quoque in animo habet infixum, suam cuique mores ‡ fortunam fingere, et multos posse, suo magis quam suorum civium tempore, perpetua quadam felicitate uti. Quare non § disputandi solum causa sed ita vivendi, voces illas Pompeianas crebro usurpat, *ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα πλείονες ἢ δυόμενον προσκυνοῦσι.*|| Multa insuper novit sibi peculiaria contigisse, quæ ad potentiam et *χρυσοῦν θέρος* ¶ munirent viam. Etenim famam, ante collectam ** quo servet Thrasybulo

---

* Æschyl. Prom. Vinct. line 309.
† Aristot. Poet. cap. 15. ‡ C. Nepos in Vit. Att.
§ Orat. pro Muræn. par. 13.
|| Plutarch in Vit. Pompeii, p. 325.
¶ Plutarc. Præc. ger. Reip. p. 798.
** Divinat. in Cæcil. par. 18.

nostro minime opus est, ut causa, in qua versetur, vel ad commemorandum sit honesta, vel æqua ad probandum. Eam cum ingreditur, nihil habet quod in offensione deperdat. Ea si cadit flagitiosissime, nihil unquam de veteribus suis ornamentis requirit. Reliqui autem temporis spem confirmat tum maxime, cum, sceleratis ne periculum facessat, præmetuens, ex eo quod in dicendo possit, aliquantulum remittat, aliorumque ex invidia quicquid deoneraverit, id omne in se ipsum trajici patiatur.

Hoc ab uno discas licet, quales sint plerique omnes, quos principum amicos appellitant. Atque hinc omnis pendet ὁ δεῖνα. His stipatus, contra quam factum oportuit, rerum ad fastigia aspiravit accessitque. Hos e latebris eorum prorepentes in publicum comites secum eduxit: imo fortunæ se cundæ jam intolerantior quasi famæ suæ quosdam fautores ac participes consiliorum, Hos

Proh Curia, inversique mores,*

in conspectu Senatus Anglicani fidenter collocavit.

Ergo referens hæc nuncius ibit
Pelidæ genitori: hæc illi tristia facta
Degeneremque Neoptolemum narrabit.†

Quamquam ego Civilibus fluctibus nunquam me commisi, optimarum tamen Partium semper volui esse et existimari; semperque mei judicii ita fui, ut, quod mihi ipsi videretur verum et æquum, facerem et sentirem, potius quam quod alii forent laudaturi. Erunt profecto qui causam mirentur eam a nobis po-

* Horat. lib. iii. Od 5 † Virg. Æn. ii.

tissimum probatam esse, quæ sit a Rege et a Senatu ipsoque Populo penitus deserta. Alii vero difficilem quandam temperantiam postulant in eo, quod coerceri reprimique non debet, ut propemodum justioribus utamur iis, qui nos sentire quid velimus * prorsus vetent, quam iis, qui contumeliosum quiddam esse statuant dicere quid sentiamus. Sed causa quidem certe manet eadem, neque ullo modo mutabitur. Temporis autem iniquitas atque invidia ita recessit ut quod in tempore mali fuit, minus jam obesse possit: quod in causa boni, id demum aliqua ex parte sit profuturum.

Illud interea non prætermittendum est, quod per hosce tres annos proximos, fautores τοῦ δείνα quocunque in loco, quoscunque inter homines, convicia vel gravissima effutierunt. Scribendi labor, est ille quidem imperitis, et turbæ pullatæ quondam relictus. Sed cum in acie quidam † homo nuper steterit, qui litteras haud omnino nesciat, cumque sit, prope sub conatu adversarii, manus erigenda, αἰσχρὸν σιωπᾶν. Dixit scriptor ille "Galbam, Othonem, Vitellium, sibi nec beneficio nec injuria esse cognitos." ‡ Dicere debuerat, se eum esse, qui "dignitatem § suam, a Vespasiano inchoatam, a Tito auctam, a Domitiano longius provectam non abnuisset."

Est quidem causa illa, si per se spectatur, perfacilis et explicata. Artibus autem hominum improborum effectum est, ut ei defensionis ratio lubrica et peri-

---

* Tacit. Hist. lib. vii.

† De Pol. Stat. M. Brit. A. D. 1787. ‡ Tacit. Hist. i. 1.

§ Ibid.

culosa sit proposita. Judicium de me quodcunque demum fuerit, modo stet illud penes sapientes ac bonos, ei certe ferendo parem me fore intelligo. At cavendum est, qua possum, ab iis, qui in verba τοῦ δεῖνα, quæcunque ἂν φαίῃ, superstitione plusquam Pythagorea obligati jurant: qui ad novam hancce civilem Disciplinam tanquam ad saxum * adhærescunt: qui denique aliorum sententias aut pejorem in partem interpretantur, aut intelligendo faciunt, ut nihil intelligant †—Meminerint ii, velim, si librum hunc nostrum legerint, et refellere se oportere sine iracundia, et refelli sine contumacia. Studiis porro nostris desinant maledicere, ne ὀνομακληδὴν in Rolliade olim cantati, malefacta ipsi noscant sua. Horum igitur in suspiciones ne forte incurramus, qualis de summa Republica sit nostra opinio, paulo enucleatius exponendum est.

Patriæ vulnera vel acerbissima et posse credideram et solere ab iis infligi, qui in libertate vindicanda acerrimos sese profitentur: qui de civitate, quæ omnibus numeris absoluta et perfecta sit, decantatas illas fabellas garriunt: qui denique Romuli ex face ipsi videntur tum denique prodiisse, cum Platonis de πολιτεία magnifice animoseque ineptiunt. Illud etiam arcte et mordicus tenemus, vim pene omnem et robur imperii esse situm in Senatu: cujus qui aut dignitatem clanculum minutatimque læserit, aut nervos subdole et malitiose eliserit, in eodem is habeatur numero oporteat quo patriæ hostes judicati. Regio quidem nomini ut infensi simus, mirum quantum abest. Regia ut po-

* Acad. Qu. lib. iii. p. 291. † Terrent. Prolog. ad And.

testas, qualis a legibus descripta sit, sarta tecta conservetur, id vero confitemur esse e re civitatis bene constitutæ et bene moratæ. Regi porro ipsi, si quod unquam signum sustulisset ad bene sperandum de republica, et gratiam et laudem deberi vel maximam semper existimavimus. Quicquid autem privata in vita juste pieque Rex fecerat, gloriandum semper putavimus vehementerque prædicandum, propterea quod principes ita sunt nati, ut eorum mores vel boni, vel mali, publice ad civitatem pertineant. At vero qui et cum Cassio τὸν ἄρχοντα,* et cum Bruto ἀρχὴν omnem omnino oderunt ex animo, eos paulo stomachosius animadvertimus in aula nuperrime volitare. Quid enim? quem fœdissimis ipsi conviciis haud ita pridem laceraverant, ab eo τὰς τυραννικὰς φιλοφροσύνας† καὶ χάριτας petierunt precario, cupide, instanter.

Fuerunt profecto viri, ut in temporibus illis sapientes habiti, qui dicerent nihil esse tam insigne ad infamiam, tamque ad memoriæ diuturnitatem stabile, quam id, in quo eos offendisses, qui et plumbeas‡ gerunt iras et longas manus§ habent. Quin ab Heroicis usque temporibus eadem ducta est opinio; siquidem in Homero legimus,

> Κρείσσων γὰρ βασιλεὺς, ὅτε χώσεται ἀνδρὶ χέρηι·
> Εἴπερ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
> Ἀλλά γε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον, ὄφρὰ τελέσσῃ
> Ἐν στήθεσσεν ἰοῖσι.‖

---

* Plutarch. Vit. Bruti, p. 987. † Ibid.

‡ Plaut. Pœnul. act iii. sc. 6.

§ Ovid. et Cowlei "Complaint" sub. fin. ‖ Iliad. i.

Verum enimvero in hoc nostro seculo plura sæpe peccantur ab iis qui populum regemque demereri volunt, quam ab iis qui et hunc dente Theonino vulnerarunt, et illum fallaciis verborumque præstigiis delinierunt et transversum egerunt. Nobis proprium hoc et peculiare est, ut principes odiosum illum τὸ μνησικακεῖν defugiant, seque præbeant nunc his, nunc illis, placabiles et perbenignos et quodammodo Ἀλλοπροσάλλους.* Et quidni ita faciant? Qui enim heri et nudiustertius contumaciam abruptam præ se ferebant, eosdem illos posse constat, si res tulerit, bonam ad frugem redire: posse quicquid in se superbiæ aut feritatis fuerit, penitus deponere: posse animos suos flectere et demittere ad obsequium deforme.†

Ii nos quidem non sumus, qui statuamus ex officio boni civis esse πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. Contra ea ut quisque de Republica optime senserit, ita maxime eum crediderimus reformidare dicendi difficultatem—at videtur tamen ab eo quod vel decorum vel honestum sit minime abhorrere, si caute nosmet ipsi timideque digitos ad fontem intendamus.

Ea nimirum conditio est rerum humanarum, ut, qui Flavia e gente nec primus nec secundus sit, summo in imperio possit versari. Potest etiam vis in civium jura sensim et pedetentim ab iis inferri, qui velint ipsum florem dignitatis refringere, qui oderint ‡ ingenium, qui virtuti invideant, eamque opprimendam putent atque etiam puniendam. Po-

* Iliad. v. 831. † Tacit. Ann. lib. iv. par. 20.
‡ Orat. pro L. C. Balbo. p. 458.

pulus autem qui statuerit tum denique Hæc salva esse, cum ex unius pendeant arbitrio et nutu, idem ille, fieri non potest, quin brevis atque insolentis lætitiæ pœnas det graves ac diuturnas.*

Hæc nos προθεσπίζοντες† scripsimus, idque nec rogatu cujusquam, nec quo potentiorum nobis gratiam posse conciliari existimemus. Si quis autem vitio nobis id vertat, multis nos laudibus extulisse tres illos viros, quibus Bellendeni opuscula dedicavimus, plurimum illa, quæ de se ipsi possunt jure et merito prædicare, nostram ad defensionem profecerint. Ἀρκεῖ γάρ (οἶμαι) τὸ τοῦ Πινδάρου, πρὸς τὸν λέοντα παντα χοῦ, καὶ πρὸς παντὰς ἐπαινεῖν αὐτοὺς, εἰπόντος, Χρῄμεῖς σοι χάριν ἀποδίδομεν, ποιοῦμεν γὰρ σε ἀληθεύειν.‡

Quod de viro § quodam optimo et nobilissimo, cum dicere multa haberem, nihil tamen composite atque honorate dixi, hac quidem in re memor fui Antalcidæ, qui, "Sophistæ cuidam laudationem Herculis recitare volenti, responderit," Τίς γὰρ αὐτὸν ψέγει;||

Periniquos autem hominum malevolorum sermunculos, scurrilemque semidoctorum dicacitatem, et alia omnia quæ pati in veritatis cultores cadit, despicimus et pro nihilo putamus. Ita enim nos Dii ament, ut nulla in quempiam malignitate aut livore inflammati sumus. Causam odimus non ho-

---

* Orat. Cæs. in Bell. Cat. Sal.

† Epist. ad Att. 11. lib. viii.

‡ Plutarch. de Vitios. Pud. tom. ii. p. 536.

§ D. de P——d. || Plur. Lacon. Apothegm. p. 217.

mines, quod quidem fidentissime dicimus de eo juvene, in quo lubentissime confitemur virtutis et ingenii igniculos quosdam illuxisse, cum curriculum gloriæ primum ingrederetur. Est autem inter carceres et metas intervallum satis longum καὶ πόλλα μέταξυ πέλει. Quin via ipsa tam lubrica est, et confragosa, et virgultis hic illic interclusa, ut in ea vel progredi quisquam vel consistere sine casu aliquo et prolapsione vix possit. Quid est quod dissimulem ea, quæ sentiam? Profecto collegæ illum videntur detraxisse de cœlo atque effecisse, non ut suorum esset omnino similis, sed ut plus æquo dissimilis esset sui. Ego illum pro ejus muneris, quod gerit, majestate et verecundia,* ne verbo quidem inclementiore a me appellatum vellem. Sed ea, quæ dixi, coegerunt me dicere pervicacia ejus et arrogantia, coegerunt isti, quos in optimum quemque immittit, aculei asperrimarum contumeliarum, coegerunt denique male parta, male gesta, male retenta imperia.

Φιλεῖ δὲ, πολλὴν γλῶσσαν ἐχέας μάτην
Ἄκων ἀκούειν ἅπερ ἐκὼν εἶπεν κακῶς.

Iniqui tamen ingratique animi esset, si ea, quæ ὁ δεῖνα nuperrime fecerat, vel dissimularem silentio, vel parce et maligne laudarem. Quod enim jura Ecclesiæ viriliter defendit, et eloquentiam suam quasi pedissequam et ancillulam adjunxit Northii prudentiæ civili, id bono cive dignissimum videtur. In iis autem, quæ ad Asiæ Præfectum spectant,

* Liv. ix. cap. 34.

† Fragm. 14. Soph. Edit. Brunck. Quod. aliter legitur in Plutarc. de cap. ex inimic. util. p. 89.

tandem aliquando resipuit, veritatique per tot difficultates eluctanti jam, et in lucem sese proferenti manus dedit.

Vere de hoc juvene dici potest, et ausum esse illum, quæ nemo * auderet prudens, et perfecisse quæ a nullo nisi felicissimo perfici possent. Quod si animum suum disciplinis honestissimis diutius ornare studuisset, et civilem dignitatis concupisset modum, quicquid tumultuando, jactitando, et multitudine inescanda adipisci † gestiit, id ei, firmata jam ætate, obtulissent omnes boni. Ipsum ‡ fieri et gerere, est illud quidem in aliqua laude ponendum, sed non tam sua sponte, quam quod paucis ea ætate contigit. A me tamen minime ὁ δεῖνα illud audiet, quod est a Timone, cum Alcibiaden a populo honoratum vidisset, nimis contumeliose et acerbe dictum, Εὖγε ποιεῖς αὐξόμενος ὦ παῖ· μέγα γὰρ αὔξη κακὸν ἅπασι τούτοις.§ Vellem profecto juvenis noster existimasset illam honorum viam rectissimam esse, quam ei optimi cives tritam reliquissent. Vellem "magna cum gratia et gloria ad summam amplitudinem pervenisset ascendens gradibus magistratuum, ut pater ejus fecerat, et reliqui clariores || viri." Illud vero, ut se habet, quem æstus quidam gloriæ absorbuerit, ei hæc verba Plutarchi ad lectitandumproponam: Ὥσπερ εἰς φρέαρ, οἶμαι, τὴν πολιτείαν τοὺς μὲν ἐμπίπτοντας αὐτομάτως καὶ παραλόγως ταράττεσθαι καὶ μετανοεῖν, τοὺς δὲ καταβαίνοντας ἐκ πα-

* Vel. Paterc. ii. cap. 15.
† Vel. Paterc. lib. ii. cap. 7.
‡ Sall. Bell. Jug. par. 88.
§ Plutarch. Vit. Alcib. p. 199.
|| Brut. p. 152.

ρασκευῆς καὶ λογίσμου καθ' ἡσυχίαν, χρῆσθαι τε τοῖς πράγμασι μετρίως, καὶ πρὸς μηδὲν δυσκολαίνειν, ἅτε δὴ τὸ καλὸν αὐτὸ καὶ μηδὲν ἀλλὸ τῶν πραξέων ἔχοντας τέλος.*

Quoniam vero emersisse jam e vadis, et scopulos prætervecti videmur, perfacilis nobis ostenditur reliquus cursus, in iis, quæ ad Bellendenum spectant, enarrandis. Gente erat Scotus. Litteris iis ornatus fuit, eoque præditus ingenio, ut de illo dici possit, quod in ore hominum eruditorum percrebruit de Buchanano οὐ Σκότος ἦν, ἀλλὰ φόως Σκοτίης. Fuit a prosapia, quantum conjectura assequor, vetere atque illustri oriundus. De vitæ autem ratione quam sibi instituerit, parum est certi quod cum lectoribus communicemus. Scoticorum scriptorum in catalogo, quem † Dempsterus confecit, dicitur Gulielmus Bellendenus fuisse humanitatis Professor Parisiis An. Dom. 1602. Gratia plurimum valebat apud Jacobum, uti a Scotis dicitur, Sextum, fuitque ei Magister supplicum libellorum. Titulus autem ille quo minus scrupulum alicui injiciat, paucula quæ ad eum explicandum faciant, lectori tanquam per lancem saturam apponenda censemus. "Libellensis, Magistratus apud Siculos, qui aliis Magister Libellorum, qui scilicet libellos supplices subditorum excipiebat, examinabat, et de iis ad Principem referebat, in Constitut. Sicul. lib. 1. tit. 38. §. 2." Du Cange, Glossar. tom. 2, "Supplicare, libellum vel preces principi offerre. l. i. Cod. ut lit. pend." Vi-

* Plutarch. præcept. ger. Reip. tom. ii. p. 799.

† Vit. Scot. scrip. vol. i. p. 481. à Mackens.

cat. Vocab. Jur. utr. tom. 4. "Magistri libellorum, in inscriptione l. un. D. de off. præf. præt. l. un. C. Theod. de curs. publ. erant, qui supplices libellos a privatis oblatos tractabant. Vocantur etiam Carthophylaces et libellani." Vicat. tom. 3.

Sed jam supplicibus dominum lassare libellis
Desine.*

Aliis gloriolæ insignibus a Jacobo ornatus sit, necne, plane nescio. Regem vero illum et a doctrina fuisse haud mediocriter instructum, et doctorum hominum maxime studiosum, nemo est qui ignoret. Effectum est igitur ejus munificentia, ut otio perquam honesto Bellendenus Parisiis frueretur. Cum in hac urbe commoraretur, aciem ingenii nolebat hebescere; sed, ut quam plurimis prodesset, omni ope atque opera enitebatur. Horum itaque trium librorum, secundum et tertium bis, primum semel ipse prelo subjecit. Ciceronis Princeps, publicam lucem vidit. Ann. Dom. 1608, sub hoc titulo "Ciceronis princeps rationes et consilia bene gerendi firmandique imperii: ex iis repetita, quæ ex Ciceronianis defluxere fontibus, in libros XVI. de statu rerum Romanarum, qui nondum lucem acceperunt—Parisiis, apud Carolum Chappelain, via amygdalina, sub signo beatæ Mariæ, CIↃ IↃCIIX—"—Huic primæ Ciceronis Principis editioni præfixus est "Tractatus de Processu et Scriptoribus rei Politicæ."—Sed in tribus de Statu libris editis 1616, eundem tenet locum, quem nos Bellendeni vestigiis fideliter insistentes, ei attribuimus.

* Martial. Epigr. lib. viii. 32.

Editio prima Ciceronis consulis hunc præ se fert titulum: "Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus. Illustratus publici observatione juris, gravissimi usus disciplina, administrandi temperata ratione: notatis inclinationibus temporum in Rep. et actis rerum in Senatu: quæ a Ciceroniana nondum edita profluxere memoria annorum DCCX. congesta in libros XVI. De statu rerum Romanorum: unde jam manavit Ciceronis Princeps, dignus habitus summorum lectione Principum. Ad inclytum Serenissimumque Principem Henricum Principem Scotiæ, et Walliæ. Per G. Bellendenum Magistrum Supplicum libellorum Augusti Regis Magnæ Britanniæ, &c. Parisiis. Apud Joannem Corbon e regione Ecclesiæ S. Hilarii, sub signo Cordis boni, M. DC. XII. Cum Privilegio Regis."

Extrait du privilege du Roy.

Très-expresses inhibitions & deffences sont faites à tous, d'imprimer ou exposer en vente le livre intitulé Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus, per Gulielmum Bellendenum, Magistrum Supplicum libellorum Augusti Regis Magnæ Britanniæ, durant le temps & espace de six ans, à commencer du jour qu'il sera achevé d'imprimer: si ce n'estoit de l'expresse permission & consentement dudit Bellenden. A peine de confiscation des livres, dommages & interests, & d'amende arbitraire; comme plus amplement est declaré & contenu audites lettres du privilege du 5. Juillet, l'an de grace mil six cens douze.

Par le Roy en son Conseil.

Signé DE VABRES.

Je soubs signé ay permis & permets a Jean Corbon Marchand Libraire juré en ceste ville de Paris, de faire imprimer & exposer en vente le livre intitulé Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus, par moy faict, & de jouyr & user pleinement

du benefice du privilege a moy sur ce octroyé par le Roy le 5. du present mois. Faict soubs mon signe le 14 Iuillet 1612.

"Hi duo libri in nomine apparuerunt Serenissimi Principis Henrici." Editio secunda vulgata est Ann. Dom. 1616. eique additus est liber de Statu prisci orbis, qui quidem anno proximo superiore typis mandatus fuerat, Caroloque Principi, fratris Henrici superstiti, dicatus.

Quamquam ab ineptiis eorum, qui fluctus in simpulo excitant, semper animus meus abhorruit, expedienda est tamen quæstio subdifficilis de tempore, quo Liber de Stat. pr. Or.. primum e scriniis Bellendeni sit emissus. In titulo trium de Statu librorum, quos constat a Bellendeno fuisse editos Ann. Dom. 1616. dicitur liber ille "nunc primum editus." Exemplar autem operis hujusce, quod in Museo Britannico asservatur, suo in titulo habet Ann. 1615. Anni porro ejusdem nota legitur in fine Dedicationis, quæ, in tribus de Statu libris anno proxime sequenti editis, tractatum de Processu rei Politicæ subsequitur. Littera etiam numeralis extrema I. in fine tutuli trium librorum videtur a typographo addita esse, postquam litteræ numerales M. DC. XV. fuissent excusæ. Ita certe se rem habere confirmo in omnibus, quæ viderim, exemplaribus. Bellendenum itaque consilia sua sic instituisse crediderim. Liber de Statu Prisci Orbis ad umbilicum perductus est 1615, et pauca exemplaria sparsim a scriptore, vel amicis suis vel forte viris quibusdam primariis dono data sunt. Complura autem exemplaria, quæ fuerant eodem tempore excusa, consulto premebantur a Bellendeno pauculos in menses; idque, ea mente,

ut iis adderentur duo libri de Principe et Consule, atque adeo justum opus de Statu uno volumine conficeretur.

In libro de Statu Prisci Orbis, tum eo, cujus exemplar in Museo Brit. reperitur, tum eo, qui in libris de Statu primum tenet locum, idem est paginarum numerus, et eadem prope operis forma, nisi quod tractatus de processu Rei Politicæ, quem hic præfixum habet, illi omnino deest.

His de causis librum de Statu Pr. Or. bis editum esse dixerim, siquidem ea, quam primam vocaverim editionem, alium præ se fert titulum, et aliud, uti aiunt, privilegium Regium proprium ac suum, quod est Bellendeno, ni fallor, concessum, postquam ei jus datum erat librorum de Statu trium edendorum.

In libro de Statu Prisci Orbis, qui prodiit ann. Dom. 1615, titulus hic legitur:

"Gulielmi Bellendeni Magistri Supplicum Libellorum Augusti Regis Magnæ Britanniæ, &c. de Statu Prisci Orbis in Religione, Re Politica, & Litteris, liber unus. Ad Serenissimum Principem Carolum Principem Scotiæ et Walliæ. Parisiis, apud Herveum de Mesnil, via S. Joannis Lateranensis, sub signo Bellerophontis Coronati. M. DC. XV. cum privilegio Regis."

Par lettres du grand seau du 1 Juin 1615, defenses sont faictes à tous d'imprimer ou vendre, soit pour le tout ou partie, les livres intitulez G. Bellendeni, &c. de statu libri tres; l'un desquels est celuy De statu Prisci Orbis, &c. durant le temps de six ans: si ce n'est du consentement dudict Bellenden; à peine de confiscation des livres dommages & interests & d' amande arbitraire: comme il est plus amplement declaré par lesdites lettres signées Le Liepure, et en queue d'Amboise.

Librorum a nobis editorum titulus ita se habet, "Gulielmi Bellendeni Magistri Supplicum Libellorum Augusti Regis Magnæ Britanniæ, &c. de Statu libri tres. 1. De Statu Prisci Orbis in Religione, Re Politica, et Litteris. 2. Ciceronis Princeps, sive de Statu Principis et Imperii. 3. Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus, sive de Statu Reip. et Urbis imperantis Orbi. Primus, nunc primum editus: cæteri, cum tractu de Processu et Scriptoribus Rei Politicæ, ab auctore aucti et illustrati. Parisiis, apud Herveum du Mesnil, via S. Joannis Lateranensis, sub signo Bellerophontis Coronati. M. DC. XVI. cum privilegio Regis.

Extrait du Privilege du Roy.

Tres expresses inhibitions & deffenses sont faictes, à tous, d'imprimer ou exposer en vente, soit pour le tout ou partie les livres intitulez Gulielmi Bellendeni magistri supplicum libellorum Augusti Regis Magnæ Britanniæ, De Statu libri tres: le premier, De Statu Prisci Orbis: le second, Ciceronis Princeps, sive de Statu Principis: le troisiesme, Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus, sive de Statu Reip. & Urbis imperantis Orbi, durant le temps & espace de six ans, à commencer du jour que lesdicts livres seront achevez d'imprimer: si ce n'estoit de l'expresse permission & consentement dudict Bellenden. à peine de confiscation des livres, dommages & interests, & d'amende arbitraire: comme plus amplement est declare & contenu aux lettres du privilege du premier Juin, l'an de grace mil six cens douze.

Par le Roy en son Conseil.

Signé Le Leipure.

Et signé en que D'Amboise.

Testimonium quoddam hisce de libris e Bauero excerpsimus. "Bellendeni (Guil.) Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus———de Statu libri 3.; videlicet, 1. de Statu Prisci Orbis in Religione, Re Politica, et Litteris. 2. Ciceronis Princeps, s. de Statu Principis et Imperii. 3. Ciceronis Consul, Senator, &c. libri rari. Widekind. p. 363." Tom. 5. Baueri Biblioth. lib. rar. univ. sive Tom. 1. Supplem. Fuit ea Bibliotheca Norinbergæ edita in quat. vol. a Johanne Jacobo Bauero ann. Dom. 1770. De hisce autem libris Bellendeni protulit in ea Bauerus οὐδὲ γρύ. Secutum est Supplementum ann. Dom. 1774, duobus voluminibus, quorum e primo verba superiora hausimus.

Saxius in præclaro illo suo Onomastico sic scribit. "Ann. Dom. 1612. Gulielmus Bellendenus, gente Scotus, Philologus, et Archæologus, hoc anno ipsi debebatur Ciceronis Consul, Senator, Senatusque Romanus, Parisiis, 8. et de tribus luminibus Romanorum liber Parisiis, 1633. fol. Vid. F. G. Freytag. Analecta Litteraria, p. 81.—David Clement Bibliotheque curieuse, tom. 3. pp. 71, 72. (50)—52)" tom. 4. p. 224.

Manca atque imperfecta sunt et Baueri et Saxii testimonia, quatenus de ordine quo libros suos Bellendenus edidisset, uterque eorum parum explorati habuit. Sciant autem lectores nullam esse eorum factam mentionem, neque a Morhofio in Polyhistor: —neque a Fabricio in Biblioth. Latin. med. et infin. ætat.—neque in Amœnitatibus Litterariis Francofurti et Lipsiæ editis 1728, quarum in tom. 2do. 5to. et 8vo. fuse elegantissimeque agitur de libris

raris:—neque in Observationibus Litterariis Halæ Magdebergicæ editis 1705, quarum in decimo volumine dissertatio de raris libris occurrit admodum docta et dilucida. Fabricius autem in Bibliotheca Antiquaria, p. 490, lectorem relegat ad editionem primam Ciceronis Consulis.

In bibliothecis tam privatis quam publicis, rarissima horum sunt librorum exemplaria. Cantabrigiæ quæ inveniri solent, hæc sunt—In Bibliothec. Aulæ Clar. editio princeps Ciceronis Consulis—In Bibl. Col. Emmanuel. qua quidem, nulla uspiam est, quod sciam, libris optimis et rarissimis magis abundans, de Statu tres libri—In Bibliotheca Academica, principis editionis Ciceronis Consulis duo exemplaria, et de Statu trium librorum exemplar unum.

In Catalogo Bodleiano Oxonii edito 1738, prorsus de iisdem siletur. Editio autem prima Ciceronis Principis in Bibliotheca illa asservatur. In Collegio Animarum Omnium unum est exemplar trium librorum de Statu.

In Museo Britannico asservatur Bellendeni liber de Statu prisci Orbis, quem quidem crediderim penes Carolum primum olim fuisse.

In domestica Regis Britannici Bibliotheca, quam sane et copia librorum et splendore vere Regiam dixeris, neque cum Ptolemæorum et Osymandyæ thesauris litterariis conferre dubitaveris, reperitur unum exemplar Ciceronis Consulis.

In Bibliotheca Regia Parisiensi, No. 1346, de juris-prudentia, unum est exemplar librorum trium de Statu.

In Bibliothec. viri Reverendi et doctissimi C. M. Cracherodii Mus. Brit. Curatoris asservantur lib. de Stat. Pr. Or. et edit. princeps Cic. Cons.

Singulis trium de Statu librorum, (quod jure mireris) Biblioth. Argatheliens. et Hunterian. omnino carent.

In Catalogis Bibliopol. Londinens. qui ann. Dom. 1787. prodierunt, duo exemplaria hujusce libri de Statu invenimus, et inventa statim arripuimus.

Humfredus Sumnerus, D. D. Etonensis, homo liberaliter eruditus, idemque ita bonus, ut non alius quisquam sit melior, dixit mihi se edit. Princ. Cic. Cons. reperisse inter libros quos sibi legasset pater suus Johannes Sumnerus, S. T. P. Græcis Latinisque litteris vir absolute doctus.

Rarissimum illum de Cicerone Principe librum G. Shuckburgius haud ita grandi pecunia nuper emit de Egertono Bibliopola Londinensi. Audiveram forte fortuna de versione hujus libelli Anglicana, quæ asservaretur in Bibliotheca doctissimi Theologi E. Apthorpii, D. D. Amicus autem quidam meus, qui libri illius inspiciendi copiam a Reverendo viro impetraverat, in Epistolis ad me datis, ita eum descripsit. "Forma, quam duodecimo vocant, est impressus, paginisque constat 88. Caret etiam tractatu de progressu Rei Politicæ qui fuerat Ciceroni Principi ab ipso scriptore præfixus." Versionis hujusce titulum (in quo nomen Bellendeni, consulto, an casu prætermissum sit, nescio) itemque dedicationem lectoribus meis apponendam puto, simul ut rem paucis cognitam in medium proferam:

simul ut ostendam, quo in pretio fuerit inter majores nostros hoc ipsum Bellendeni opus

CICERO'S PRINCE.

THE REASONS AND COUNSELS
FOR SETTLEMENT AND GOOD GOVERNMENT
OF A KINGDOM,
COLLECTED OUT OF
CICERO'S WORKS.

By T. R. Esq.

LONDON:
Printed for S. MEARNE, Bookbinder to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, and are to be sold at his house in Little Britain, 1668.

To His
Grace the DUKE of
MONMOUTH
AND
BACCLEUGH, &c.

This piece was once a jewel (wrapt up in Latine) in the cabinet of the renowned Prince Henry, and composed by an excellent artist out of the rich mines of that famous statesman and orator M. Tullius Cicero. It hath in it maximes, which void of stains, and flaws of Machiavillian interest, are raised only upon principles of honor and vertue, which best become a Prince. In the discourse, they are directed to a Soveraign, but may be of no less use to any great person, whose birth or quality may render him capable of derivative authority, in the management of affairs of state, and what is honorable and becoming a Prince, must needs be so in his Ministers, who should be his imitators. Your

graces qualifications and years may reasonably expect ere long to be called to imployment, in which your care and good conduct of your self may satisfie the expectation of the world, and divert the censures of a malicious age, which your grace prevents by considering your station, and that though your years are but few, yet great men as they are planted near the Prince, ought to be (like trees on rich ground) sooner ripe for affairs than other of meaner condition, which cannot be without an early application of themselves to some serious thoughts of business, either in the practice and observation of present transactions, or by reading what hath been done in the world before them; but of this your grace is already sensible; so that I have selected this for its brevity only, to lye by you as a memorial to prompt you to put these maximes, in time, into such practice as may gain you that honour and esteem in the world, to which with a laudable ambition you ought to aspire, and render yourself serviceable to your King and Country, which is in this the sole design and most earnest desire of

Your Grace's
in all duties of a faithful
and humble servant,
T. R.

Obiter monendus est lector "regnandi præcepta ab Augusto parente filio suo tradita," ad quæ respexerit Bellendenus in Præfatione Ciceronis Principis, Londini esse edita sub hoc Titulo: "Βασιλικὸν Δῶρον, or his Magestics instructions to his dearest

Sonne, Henrie the Prince. At London, imprinted by Richard Field, for John Norton, according to the copie printed at Edenburg, 1603." Fuerit quoque operæ pretium lectores Bellendeni docere de re alia, quæ mihi inter legendum verisimilis videatur: numeros nempe marginales ab eo adhibitos convenire "Ciceronis editioni Aldinæ, cui Editiones Pauli Manutii Aldi F. et Uvendelin. Argentoratensis, (si Nizolio* credendum est) ad amussim respondeant: Robertique aut Caroli Stephani exemplaria ita respondeant, ut binæ Aldi aut Pauli paginæ pro una deputari possint." Notissimum est autem in editione Aldi actiones in C. Verrem septem haberi, quarum prima sit ea, quæ nunc vocatur "Divinatio in Q. Cæcilium."

Libris de Statu præfigenda esse statuimus Carmina bina, quorum exemplar forma quartana impressum in Museo Britannico asservatur.

Haud moleste feret lector candidus, si de majore opere Bellendeni, quod de tribus luminibus Romanorum inchoaverat, paucula in transcursu adjiciam.

Cum in eo esset Bellendenus, ut hosce tres libros, qui a nobis editi sunt, conficeret, Ciceronem lectitabat studiose. Cujus autem scripta manu diurna nocturnaque versaverat: cujus verba, tanquam ungues digitosque suos pernoscebat, cujus doctrinam multiplicem et reconditam, animo suo omnem omnino complectebatur, hujus vehementiore, ut fit, amore flagravit, afficique se sensit majore ejusdem admiratione. Suæ igitur famæ, cum intelligeret,

* Vid. Præf. Nizol.

quantam segetem et materiam comparasset, ad aliud quoddam opus, quod difficilius et splendidius esset, accinxisse se videtur. Quæ de Cicerone olim scripserat, ea omnia novo ordine disposuit. Plura, quæ in manu habebat, novo operi, quod de Tribus Luminibus conficiebat, solertissime intexuit. Supremam vero manum quo minus libro imponeret, in iis quæ ad Senecam et Plinium spectarent, colligendis atque ordinandis, mors ipsius (ut a me antea dictum est) impedivit. In illa tamen, quæ vulgata est, parte, nihil reperiri potest, quod non summa sit elaboratum industria, et summo ingenio perfectum. Etenim quæ aut eleganter a Cicerone dicta, aut subtiliter excogitata, sparsim in ejus operibus legi solent, ea nobis uno aspectu legenda Bellendenus proposuit, et in clariore quadam luce collocavit. Hunc itaque librum qui lectitaverit, magnam tenebit omnis fere antiquitatis et exemplorum vim: magnam juris Romani civilisque Scientiæ cognitionem sibi comparabit: magnam veluti de Thesauro quodam poterit depromere verborum exquisitissimorum copiam.

Ciceronis opera, qualia ab Oliveto edita essent, Oxonienses haud ita pridem typis pulcherrimis mandare dignati sunt, et novis quibusdam lectionibus MSS. augere et illustrare. Fecerint autem Cantabrigienses, quod eruditis omnibus gratissimum fuerit, si Bellendeni opus, egregie illud quidem comparatum ad Ciceronis famam conservandam atque etiam exornandam, prelo Academico subjecerint.

Scripsit vir * quidam ingeniosissimus et πολυμα-

* Wart. super Pop. Script. tom. ii. p. 324.

ὕστατος "multa libri ejus exemplaria, cum in Angliam vehenda essent, naufragio perisse." Quo quidem fato usa sunt biblia * Suesica Marci Ann. Dom. 1637, in 8vo. excusa; et Biblia † regia vel Polyglotta typis Plantinianis octo voluminibus edita Ann. Dom. 1516. Exstitisse etiam olim creduntur orationes quædam Jacobi Critoni,‡ Scoti doctissimi, quæ "non reperiuntur nisi frustatim impressæ." Sunt autem illæ, Gabriele Naudæo judice, mellito eloquentiæ flumine largissime tinctæ." Qui igitur in unum fasciculum eas collegerit, et recudendas curaverit, optime de viris doctis merebitur.

Fuit profecto quoddam tempus, cum in linguis Græcis Latinisque ediscendis Scoti plurimum operæ collocabant. Putabantur iidem perbene Latine loqui, et quidem § litteratius, quam plerique Anglorum qui illo ipso tempore in eadem Palæstra versabantur. Horum vero in studia virorum transversa incurrebat fortuna Reipublicæ. Quicquid autem cum Musis aliquod commercium habebat, id omne penitus conticuit in temporibus parum tranquillis, interque strepitum, qui subinde auditus est, armorum. Huc accedit quod multi, qui in litteris existimabantur plurimum posse, vel a studiis partium abhorrentes, vel amplioris cujusdam doctrinæ cupidi, vel aliis adducti causis minime inhonestis peregre ibant, neque in patriam revertebantur. Quid est igitur, quod miremur scripta permulta Scotorum intercidisse, ut eorum nunc appareat nec vola nec vestigium?

* Amœnitat. Litterar. tom. ii. p. 397. † Ibid. p. 398.
‡ Ibid. p. 404.
§ V. Morhof de pura dict. Latin. edit. Mosheim, p. 42.

Optimorum illam librorum jacturam ut feramus aliquanto levius, animus noster se convertit ad lætiorem rerum faciem, quæ Scotiam cuivis aspicienti ultro se offert. Vacillarat usque ad hanc ætatem et quidem jacuerat inter Scotos Philosophia, non modo illa, quæ de vita et moribus agit, sed præpotens ea et gloriosa, quæ in rerum Metaphysicarum contemplatione posita, non rivulos scientiæ consectatur, sed penitissimos ipsos fontes audet aperire. Est autem ea nuper excitata a doctissimis quibusdam viris felicissimeque exculta, tantumque habet lumen litterarum elegantiorum, ut de quæstionibus perobscuris et perdifficilibus copiose jam ornateque scribere multi soleant. Quin Philosophorum, qui maximo acumine et subtilitate præditi suas quisque familias olim duxerunt, eorum luminibus videtur obstruxisse posteriorum quasi exaggerata altius oratio.*

Difficile est sane enumerare, quot inter Scotos Philosophi paucis ante annis exstiterint, quanta iidem scientia fuerint, quantaque in suis studiis varietate et copia. Neque enim una in re separatim elaborarunt, sed omnia, quæcunque poterant, vel pervestigatione mentis humanæ, vel disserendi ratione comprehenderunt. Horum itaque sub auspiciis doctrinarum illud divortium,† quod est Socrate quondam auctore factum, in desuetudinem paulatim abibit, renovabiturque illa, quæ veteribus perplacuit, dicendi et intelligendi societas. Profecto hæ sunt, artium optimarum nunc discordantium inter se et

* Brutus, p. 140. † Lib. iii. p. 126.

divulsarum, nunc amice conjurantium, quasi conversiones. Hoc illud est, quod a Cicerone * dicitur, "ubi perspecta vis sit rationis ejus qua causæ rerum atque exitus cognoscantur, mirum quendam omnium tanquam consensum doctrinarum concentumque reperiri." Huc etiam tendunt animorum illi motus et concertationes jucundissimæ ingeniorum, quibus Scotia jam omnis in Philosophia excolenda fervet, ut ita dicam, ac tumultuatur. Philosophis autem ipsis consultum erit pulcherrime, cum ex argutiarum angulis et verborum angustiis, in quas diu sunt immeritoque conclusi, poterunt se penitus expedire: poterunt e gyro exiguo in quendam ingentem descendere immensumque campum: poterunt vires suas explicare et excutere totas. Enimvero quicquid ab illis scriptum fuerit, nulla unquam ætas delebit. Quam Bellendenus et Critonus experti sunt fortunam, illa neutiquam vel in Smithii scriptis, vel Humii, vel Reidii, vel Beatteii, tristi clade iterabitur.

Laborum qui me diu constrictum tenuerunt, eorum intercapedinem omnem impendere soleo in libris Græcis Latinisque evolvendis. Quare veniam mihi candidus lector facile dabit, si aut verba aut sententias, quæ mihi inter legendum arriserint, in usus hujusce præfationis identidem transtulerim. Qui enim Bellendeni hoc opus e tenebris eripiendum esse statuissem, mihi ipsi statuebam id licere facere, quod ab eo viderem multo sæpiis esse multoque solertius factitatum.

---

* De Orat. lib. iii. p. 124.

Loca insigniora, quæ occurrerint in scriptoribus, quorum sæpe verbis disertis, sæpe totis sententiis, ex professo usus sim, in margine esse notanda existimavi: idque ea mente feci, non ut illa, quæ lectitassem, pueriliter et inepte ostentarem, sed, ut Bellendeni fidem diligentiamque sequerer, et consilii, quo multa laudavissem, vis omnis ac ratio penitus perspicerentur. At si qui sunt, quibus propositum illud meum minus probare possim, eorum captiunculis et sannis occurrere a vitio propius foret, quam a laude.

Imitatio veterum, qualis tandem esse debeat, non est nostrum dijudicare. Suus est cuique in hac re gustus, suum etiam judicium. Verbis fere omnibus, modo perspicua et apta sint, in Latine scribendo locum esse crediderim. Neque enim solæ phrases, aut * sola vocabula, sed totius orationis habitus colorque potissimum spectandi sunt. Habeat igitur, per me licet, ipsa morositas aliquid tum excussationis, tum etiam laudis, in μελετήμασι concinnandis. Hujusmodi autem in opusculis, arbitror parum referre, utrum scriptores, e quibus verba petita sint, aurea, an argentea in ætate Linguæ Latinæ floruerint. Quicquid rei cuique, quæ tractanda sit, maxime conveniens fuerit, id demum mihi videtur optimum. Aliorum vero, sive obscuram in verbis conquirendis diligentiam et περιεργίαν, sive aurium sensum fastidiosum et prope κακόζηλον, is sane ego sum, qui neque acriter improbandum, neque arcte et ambitiose sequendum esse statuam. "Aurea ex

* Vide Scheller. Append.

ætate, inquit* Cellarius, cum pauci scriptores ad nostra tempora pervenerint, nimis pauper Latinitas esset, si nihil approbandum sit, quod e Cicerone aut æquali non habeamus. Altera quoque ætas, quæ argentea dicitur, subvenire nobis debet, quæ non solum compensat, si qui libri superioris ævi interierunt; sed subinde etiam, ut fieri solet successu temporum nova verba, non minus eleganter tamen, et suffragio populi Romani formata superaddit."

Quod textum, et marginem, et alia istiusmodi verba sine ulla præfatione, et quasi παραμυθίᾳ, usurpavi, id ne bilem moveat inter eos, qui limatulum præ cæteris et politulum habere judicium sibi videantur. Sed quorsum hæc tam seria tantula in causa? Quia profecto nodum hisce in scirpis quærunt homines nasutuli ac maligni, ea cum ignorent, quæ subtiliter de his cavillationibus et erudite ab Henrico Stephano disputata sunt. Rem vir ille doctus et ingeniosus huc deduxit: "nimium † sane fuerint delicatæ aures, quæ talia vocabula ferre non poterunt, quum præsertim alia desint."

Non defuturos esse scio, qui ægre ferant, me conjunctionibus quibusdam et adverbiis apices‡ subinde affixisse. At non meum est tenuiter et κατὰ μίτον respondere ad istos loquaces subarrogantesque rixa-

* Cellarii curæ posteriores, p. 93, edit. 2da.

† Pseudo Cicer. p. 96.

‡ These 'apicès' have been altogether omitted, partly from their real inutility, but chiefly because, from the want of consistency and uniformity in the former edition, they were manifestly not such as the author designed, or could have approved. —Edit.

tores, qui in hisce quæstiunculis tricari solent, et Laureolam, ut dicitur, in Mustaceo quærunt. Scriptores profecto Romani, quid in hoc genere, vel fecerint, vel non fecerint, subturpe esset nescire. Quare omnia, quæ a Dausquio, a Schurzfleischio, a Norisio, a Lipsio, a Schellero, a Noltenio aliisque bene multis Orthographiæ,* ut ita dicam, auctoribus disputata sunt, qua potui, diligentia maxima, legi religique; sed morem in hac levi re, nescio quomodo, fecit ipse recentiorum usus, qui sane, cum, ex quo fonte profluxerit, haud ignarus sum, tum, quod veterum scriptorum exemplo careat, non ita valde laboro.

Latinis Græca verba si miscui, sciat lector me id fecisse, non quo sermonem fore concinniorem intelligerem, nedum quod difficile et mirum illud putarem, quod contingere cuipiam posset, qui litteras hasce modo a limine salutasset. Rem quam in animo habebam, sæpe acu tangere ea, quæ legeram, videbantur. Sæpe sperabam posse me, quæ a Græcis elegantissime scripta essent, non, tanquam purpureos pannos, orationi meæ assuere, sed, veluti tesserulas in emblemate vermiculato † sententiis Latinis inserere, quæ eas distinguerent et illuminarent. An vero dubitamus, quin lectoribus Græce scientibus, Græca verba qualia in scriptoribus suis reperiantur, Latine iisdem conversis gratiora sint futura?

Num quis miratur, quid causæ fuerit, quare juveni cuidam præclaro Græcum nomen imposuerim?

---

* V. Longus. F. Caper. Qu. T. Scaurus, &c. vid. Putsch. Gram. A. A.

† Cicer. de Orat. lib. iii. p. 133.

Equidem in hac re secutus sum exemplum Nicolai Heinsii, qui in Epistolis ad Gronovium scriptis Gevartium, quem contumeliæ causa nominatum aperte nollet, τόν δεῖνα vocitabat.

Jam vero illud absit, ut quivis suspicetur, me in iis, quæ vel de meo depromserim, vel a Bellendeno scripta ediderim, velle ad populum provocare. Nullus sane dubito placiturum esse vacuis et eruditis auribus Bellendeni opus: quod tamen, committere nolim, ut manibus unquam sordescat eorum, qui in rebus quotidianis et vernaculis garrulam suæ infantiæ disciplinam produnt, "Volsceque et Osce fabulantur, cum Latine nesciant."

Animo equidem toto ad illud connisus sum, ut Bellendeni fama radices ageret altissime. Quamobrem, ea si disseminetur, quam latissime possit, inter homines harum deliciarum studiosos, non solum officio meo ipse cumulatissime satisfecisse, verum etiam voti mei esse mihi videbor omnino compos.

Molem hujusce Voluminis auget Præfatio ita tamen, ut emtoribus in re pecuniaria non sit oneri. Ne cogitaveram quidem de ea scribenda, antequam inter me et Typographum convenerat de omnibus operis imprimendi instrumentis, de Figuris Æneis, atque adeo de pretio quod imponi libro deberet. Sub finem Octobris, quicquid de Bellendeno compertum habueram chartis meis illevi. Aure vero jam tum fervebam vaporata ‡ a libris hisce legendis, siquidem multa in illis uberrime et gravissime de

* Vid. Burman. Syllog. vol. iii. pp. 138 & 183.
† Titinius in Quinto. ‡ Pers. Sat. 1.

rebus Politicis disputentur. Plurima autem, ut in inter scribendum fit, ad Rempublicam nostram per tinentia in mentem venerunt, quæ temperare mih non potui, quin stylo signarem. Ita accidit, ut, qu institui cœpisset urceus, tandem aliquando amphor exierit. Recte, an secus, fecerim, cum aleæ plenun periculosæ argumentum consulto tractarem, mea pa rum refert, dum Bellendenus, veluti quodam postli minii jure, in civitatem restituatur.

Vale L. B. et hosce nostros in Bellendeno edendo labores, qui te delectare quidem, aut etiam tibi pro desse possint, æqui boni consulas.

Dabam Londini Calend. Maii,
A. D. 1787.

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS

ON

POLITICS, JURISPRUDENCE, MORALS,

AND RELIGION;

INTERSPERSED WITH CHARACTERS.

The following "Remarks," thus abruptly introduced, and stripped of the circumstances which led to them, are taken from a pamphlet published by Dr. Parr, in a private controversy, soon after the occurrence of the Birmingham riots. The occasion which gave rise to the controversy was entirely of a local and personal nature, and long since forgotten; but the "Remarks" which, in his usual excursive manner, were incidentally thrown in, seemed to the Editors worthy of preservation.

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS

ON

POLITICS, JURISPRUDENCE, MORALS, &c.

In the purity * of my conversation, in the regularity of my morals, in the diligent and conscientious discharge of my professional duties, and in a steady attachment to the Established Religion of my Country, I will not yield the palm of superiority to any Clergyman now living, however exalted may be his rank, however distinguished may be his talents, and however applauded may be his orthodoxy. Whether or no the course of my reading, and the habits of my thinking, may have led me to more correct notions, and to a more ardent love of civil and religious freedom,† than some men are sup-

---

* For all the egotisms which follow, I can offer the candid reader no other plea than that of self-defence; and upon the validity of that plea he may determine as he goes on. In the mean time, I shall say, with old Plutarch, ἀμέμπτως ἐστὶν, ἂν ἀπολογούμενος τοῦτο ποιῇς πρὸς Διαβόλην ἢ κατηγορίαν.—See vol. ii. page 540. edit. Xyland.

† "The liberty," say I with Mr. Burke, the only liberty, "I mean, is a liberty connected with order, and that not only exists with order and virtue, but cannot at all exist without them. It inheres in good and steady government, as in its substance and vital principle."—Burke's Appeal, page 35.

"To be possessed," as Mr. Burke elsewhere says, "it must be limited; but it is a good to be improved, not an evil to be lessened. It is not only a private blessing of the first order,

posed to entertain, is a question which I will not discuss in the extent to which I might carry such a discussion without insincerity and without impropriety. But my principles, I am sure, will never endanger the Church; my studies, I hope, are such as do not disgrace it; and my actions, I can say with confidence, have uniformly tended to preserve it from open, and from what I conceived to be unjust, attacks.

When my beloved and respected friend Dr. John Jebb, was conducting a petition "for a relief from subscription," I was no stranger to the splendid talents and exemplary virtues which distinguished many of his associates. I was no enemy to that active and impartial spirit of enquiry, which had led other men into opinions far bolder than my own. But I refused to act with Dr. Jebb, because his plan grasped at too much in too short a time, and because I had been informed of a more temperate scheme, which was to have been laid before Archbishop Cornwallis by two ecclesiastical dignitaries, who have since been deservedly raised to the episcopal bench.

Upon all reformations, whether civil or ecclesiastical, I look not only to the wishes and to the arguments of individuals, but to the collective wisdom of the legislature.

In the earlier part of my life I thought the Test

---

but the vital spring and energy of the state itself, which has just so much life and vigour as there is liberty in it." These two passages occur in pages 57 and 58 of Mr. Burke's "Thoughts on the Cause of the present Discontents;" and they are very judiciously quoted in page 92 of Sir Brooke Boothby's very candid and sensible Letter to Mr. Burke.

Act oppressive; but in the year 1782 I very carefully and very seriously re-examined the subject, and changed my opinion. In 1790 I strenuously opposed the attempt to procure a repeal; and y I cannot help indulging the comfortable hope, that in the progress of intellectual and moral improvement religious animosities will at last subside, and that the restraints for which I have contended, and do now contend, will no longer be thought necessary for the public safety, by the heads of that Church, which I have never deserted, and by the members of that Legislature, which I have never disobeyed.

In the mean time, I think it my duty to distinguish between the private and the public characters, between the literary merits and the political singularities, between the substantial virtues and the occasional indecorums of those persons who may not agree with me in my religious creed; and, perhaps, if the same distinctions were now and then made by greater and wiser men than myself, the general tranquillity of the kingdom would not be less permanently secured, and the noblest interests of virtue would be promoted more effectually. From the indignation, therefore, which I felt at the behaviour of one person in respect to Dr. Priestley's letters, let no man infer (for without uncharitableness, and without injustice no man living can infer,) that I am an advocate for latitudinarianism in the Church, or a confederate with republicans * in the state.

* My political creed lies in a short compass, and I will tell it to the reader in better words than my own;

Τοῖς μὲν ἐλευθερία γιγνέσθω μετὰ βασιλικῆς ἀρχῆς, τοῖς δὲ

There are in this kingdom men of no mean consideration for ability and rank, men whom I thoroughly know, and sincerely regard, and by whom I am myself neither unknown, nor, I would hope, unregarded. These men, I believe, are not accustomed to charge me with any overweening fondness for sects, or any blind confidence in the leaders of sects. They are aware, that with great constitutional warmth of temper I unite those habits of discrimination which gradually teach men to be impartial in opinion, to be temperate in action, and to accommodate the results of abstract speculations to the real state of man. Sometimes they may give me the praise of a little sagacity for discerning a greater or a less portion of bigotry, in every quarter where I see any excess of zeal upon points of doubtful evidence, and, perhaps, of utility, more doubtful. But they have much oftener seen me assailed with good humoured raillery, for some wayward propensities towards the sternness of Toryism, when I resisted the vicious refinements of theory, and condemned all immoderate ardour for sudden and sweeping innovations, of which I neither perceive the immediate necessity, nor can calculate the distant consequences. They know that I ascribe the

---

ἀρχὴ ὑπεύθυνος βασιλικὴ, δεσποζόντων νόμων τῶν τε ἄλλων πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν βασιλέων αὐτῶν, ἄν τι παράνομον πράττωσιν.—Platon. Epist. viii. p. 355. vol. iii. edit. Serran.

Such, if I have read to any purpose, is the spirit of the English constitution, and such too the very letter of the English law. "Rex," says Bracton, "sub Deo et lege. Rex habet superiorem Deum, item legem, per quam factus est rex," &c.—Lib. ii. cap. 16.

most intelligible part of man's equality, and the best security for man's rights, to the wise regulations of society;* that I applaud one antient philosopher † for the preference he gives to the geometrical proportion adopted by Lycurgus over the artithmetical which Solon,‡ perhaps by compulsion, employed; and that I concur with another great writer,§ in commending those political institutions, where both of these proportions are occasionally introduced, and judiciously attempered.—They know that reverencing even the wilder eccentricities || of a passion for

---

* I do not intend to say, that all the rights of men derive their origin from society, but that, in a well-regulated society, their natural rights are recognized, preserved, defined, and invigorated. In such a society, therefore, I would readily allow, with M. Mirabeau, that "obligatory law is only, and can only be, the faithful expression of natural right clothed with the sanction of the public consent."—Mirab. on Lettres de Cachet, vol. i. p. 190.

† Ὁ γὰρ Λυκοῦργος τὴν ἀριθμητικὴν ἀναλογίαν, ὡς δημοκρατικὴν καὶ ὀχλικὴν οὖσαν, ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τῆς Λακεδαίμονος· ἐπεισήγαγε δὲ τὴν γεωμετρικὴν, ὀλιγαρχίᾳ σώφρονι καὶ βασιλείᾳ νομίμῃ πρέπουσαν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀριθμῷ τὸ ἴσον, ἡ δὲ λόγῳ τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν ἀπονέμει.—Plut. Sympos. lib. viii. quest. 2. p. 719. vol. ii. edit. Xyland.

‡ Ὁ μὲν οὖν Σόλων ἀποφηνάμενος περὶ πολιτείας, ὡς ἰσότης στάσιν οὐ ποιεῖ, λίαν ἔδοξεν ὀχλικῶς ἀριθμητικὴν καὶ δημοκρατικὴν ἐπεισάγειν ἀναλογίαν ἀντὶ τῆς καλῆς γεωμητρικῆς.—Plut. de Frat. Amor. p. 484.

§ Διὸ δεῖ, τὰ μὲν ἀριθμητικῇ ἰσότητι χρῆσθαι, τὰ δὲ τῇ κατ' ἀξίαν.—Arist. de Repub. lib. v. cap. 4. p. 387. vol. ii.

The reader will not confound my meaning with Mr. Burke's strictures (p. 269 of the Reflections) upon the geometrical distribution and arithmetical arrangement of France.

|| "Grand swelling sentiments of liberty, I am sure, I do not

liberty, I never would break down the fences of subordination, and that, detesting priestcraft and kingcraft, under all disguises whatsoever, and for all purposes whatsoever, I would sooner perish than lend my assistance to the abolition of priests and kings.—Qualify, say I, and improve; and, if there be real occasion, restrain; but, destroy not. Anticipate change by well-timed and well-proportioned regulation; but provoke it not by superfluous and precarious experiment.* Drive not away with a frown even the visionary reformer, give the tribute of a hearing to the speculative recluse, but act not, till your plan of action has received its last and best stamp of merit from the approbation of men whom practice in public affairs has not made callous to the public weal. Do not give either good men the inclination to subvert tumultuously, or bad men the power to undermine insidiously, what may be safely

---

despise. They warm the heart, enlarge and liberalize our minds, they animate our courage in a time of conflict."—Burke's Reflections, p. 360. See also p. 17 of his Appeal.

* "It is good also," says Bacon, "not to try experiments in states, except the necessity be urgent, or the utility be evident; and well to beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change, and not the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation."

They who complain of wise saws, and of what Cicero calls ignavæ rationes, in Bacon's Essay upon Innovation, would do well to look for a clearer and steadier light in Sir Matthew Hale's Considerations, "touching the Amendments or Alteration of Laws." Upon all great subjects of policy and law, this great man, as was justly said of him in the House of Lords by another great man now living, "is no barren authority."

and advantageously preserved.* Do not let loose the multitude to put forth their own enormous and irresistible strength, in vindication both of their own ideal and actual rights. Let governors be parties, and indeed leaders, in the improvement of government—let parliamentary wisdom and parliamentary authority be employed in parliamentary reform, not merely for the honour of parliament, but in conformity to the sober judgment, and the solid interests of the people, for whom, and by whom, parliament subsists. Sooner or later this must be done, and this being done well, few things will remain undone, which ought to be done at all.†

---

* "I would not exclude alteration neither; but even when I changed, it should be to preserve," &c. p. 363 of Reflections. And again: "A disposition to preserve, and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my standard of a statesman. Every thing else is vulgar in the conception, and perilous in the execution."—Page 233.

† "Were both the progressive reward of well-directed industry, and that which is obtained at the termination of its endeavours, much inferior to their usual amount, one powerful reason would still remain to impel mankind to the pursuit of every attainable object, and to make them aspire after every apparent improvement of their actual condition, whatever it may be;

—— 'Omnia fatis
In pejus ruere, ac retro sublapsa referri,
Ni vis humana' ——

The silent course of time is continually taking away from that which we possess, and from the high perfection of whatever we have cultivated and refined. Nothing ever stands still. If progress is not made, we must decline from the good state

Nam sic habetote, magistratibus, iisque qui præsunt, contineri rempublicam, et ex eorum compositione quod cujusque reipublicæ genus sit, intelligi. Quæ res, quum sapienter moderateque constituta sit a majoribus nostris, etsi magna quædam et præclara, at non multa tamen, habeo quæ putem novanda in legibus,—Vid. Cic. Fragm. p. 590, vol. ii. edit. Gruter.

But why should I shroud my meaning in dark and dastardly generalities? Some well-considered plan for a reform in Parliament, with a just attention to every species of property, personal and real, and with little or no change in the circumstance of duration—the removal of every ensnaring ambiguity, and every oppressive partiality, on the subject of libels—the revisal of the poor laws, the tithe laws, and the excise laws—the mitigation of the penal code—the regulation, but not the suppression, of the ecclesiastical courts—the regulation, or the suppression, of every corrupt and imperious corporation—the establishment of a more vigorous police—and, above all, a more serious attention of the legislature to the cause of education, both for the prevention of crimes, and the improvement of virtue—

---

already attained, and as it is scarcely ever in our power to replace the waste of time and of chance, in those very respects in which they have impaired our condition, we ought to endeavour to compensate those inevitable losses by acquisition of other advantages, and augmentations of good; especially of those which the same course of things brings forward to our view, and seems to present to us, as the object of reasonable desire."—Dunbar's Essay on the Criterion of civilized Manners.

these are the objects which I have most at heart. Ashamed I am not of avowing them, because they loosen no one ancient bulwark, because they leave the crown, the peerage, and the church, nothing to fear, and because they give to the nation at large much indeed to hope. In the progress of political knowledge, the Tories, as well as the Whigs, of this Country, may claim their share of improvement, and the result is, that each party has gradually retreated from those violent extremes, to which their respective principles may be supposed to tend, directly or indirectly. Indeed, I have myself the pleasure of knowing some enlightened Tories who concur with me in thinking, that by the temporary union, or even by the generous emulation, of statesmen, in giving effect to the measures just now mentioned, our constitution would be preserved and invigorated. But they, who comprehend all the reasons which occur to men of reflection for going thus far, are not entirely ignorant of first principles, and, by not venturing to go farther, they shew, that their prudence is not oppressed by theory, nor their loyalty warped by patriotism.

In respect to France, I distinguish with the acute, the humane, and the elegant Mr. Dupont, between the necessity of the French Revolution, and the proceedings of the National Assembly. Upon many of those proceedings I am at a loss to decide, because I hear such violent and contradictory reports about the characters of the agents, and the motives of their actions. In reality, the opportunities for information in this country are too scanty, and its

channels are too impure, for the wisest men to determine on the justice of many detached measures: and in France the time has been far too short to ascertain their utility. But upon the more prominent features of the new government, an Englishman may now be permitted to speak with less hazard of error, and less offence to decorum.

Δεινός εἰμι, σκότεινον ἀπέχων
Φόγον. PIND. Nem. 7.

For my part, then, I see much to lament, and much to condemn, in the ungracious act of wrenching from the crown the splendid prerogative of making war and peace, in the hopeless wreck of nobility,* in the withered humours of the dignified

* Recollecting the heroes and patriots, whose names adorned the history of France, I was shocked to find their descendants involved in the same sentence with those upstarts, by whom peerage itself was disgraced in proportion as peers were multiplied. I must, however, confess that a calm and well-informed observer convinced me, after much discussion, that upon the close of the late government, and even after introduction of the present, no distinction could be immediately made with safety. Yet I most anxiously hope that, upon the first return of tranquillity, and even among the first conditions of reconciliation, it may be proposed, that the old peers be restored to a part of their antient dignity, that, like the old Cortes of Castile, they may appear personally, or, like the Scotch peers, they may sit by representation, in the National Assembly, and, above all, that they may collectively constitute a supreme court of judicature similar to that of the Lords in this country. History, I am sure, does not record, nor can imagination easily conceive, a tribunal with rules of decision so equitable and comprehensive, with sources of information so pure and so ample,

ecclesiastics, in the tumultuous election of prelates by their clergy, in the shattered fortunes of the exiles, and in that decree, which ravished from primogeniture all its salutary, as well as all its noxious privileges, instantaneously and indiscriminately. At the same time, more and greater subjects, not of blame, but of commendation, rise to my view, in some of the attempts that have been made to simplify that intricate, uncouth, and ponderous system of jurisprudence which clogged the decisions of property, in the abolitions of Lettres de Cachet, in the institution of Trial by Jury, in the mitigation of punishments, in the temporary power of controlment wisely reserved to loyalty, in the inviolability, no less wisely ascribed to the person of the king, in the plenary toleration granted to religious sects, in the respect paid to the doctrines and the ceremonies of the national church, in the provisions established for the more laborious orders of the clergy, in the principles, though, perhaps, not the immediate tendencies, of the measures which have been adopted for

---

or with such a spirit of impartiality, and such a dignity of character, as have long distinguished our House of Peers. This momentous circumstance deserves to be well considered by those who, without offering any substitute for peers in their judicial capacity, contend for the extinction of the order. But, when the honour of nobles is treated as a visionary principle in political theories, a plain and direct appeal to the events of every session will crush the charge, and convince us that, in decisions upon the property of all citizens of all classes whatsoever, the honour of the highest class is a real and most efficient principle.

lightening the pressure of the public debt, and, above all, in the spirit, though not the entire detail, of those regulations,* which give real energy to the

* My opinion is, that the French people never were completely free. They obtained, it is true, an occasional and temporary mitigation of slavery, through the contentions for power which at various times arose between the monarchs of France on the one hand, and the old noblesse and the clergy on the other. Such too in other feudal states have been the dawnings of liberty, where, as in France, its pure and auspicious light was soon involved in the gloom of despotism. They who attend to the history of France, must know that the Commons in that country never possessed that effective share in legislation, which the Commons in England have gradually acquired. The reader will see more on this subject in Bolingbroke's 15th Letter upon Parties. But while I agree with Bolingbroke that the Commons of France, assembled under the name of Les Etats, never had any great weight in legislation, I maintain that the very act of assembling them supplied a principle upon which they, in happier times, have founded a right to extend their powers. It is to be lamented, indeed, that after the administration of Richlieu and Mazarine no traces of freedom can be discovered in the government of France, nor does any attempt to discover them seem to have been made by Mr. Burke himself. Let those who think a peerage adverse to freedom remember that Richlieu and Mazarine completed the task of humbling the nobility, which had been begun, and with some interruption pursued, by former despots. I wish to see in our own country the peerage preserved, but not to see peers wantonly or insidiously multiplied. I wish to see them invested, not with teazing and invidious privileges, but with substantial and splendid rights. Indeed, by the spirit of the English constitution, they are the supporters, not the creatures, of the crown. They are legislators for the people, but not their oppressors. They have a common interest with the people, and an uncommon obligation to preserve it. While their du-

suffrages of the people in the uncorrupt choice of their own representatives for the permanent preserva-

---

ties in public life thus assist in upholding the state, their manners in private life must be allowed to adorn society. Habitually conscious of a dignity which invites respect without imposing submission, they seldom wound the feelings of delicate and independent minds by the gross insolence of wealth, or by the overbearing arrogance of station. They are placed above those petty competitions for importance, and those petty incitements to tyranny, which we sometimes lament in the inferior ranks of our gentry. They are not more rapacious than other members of the community as landlords, nor more contentious as neighbours, nor more immoral, I would hope, as men. They are at once too great to be generally envied, and not great enough to be generally feared. Such, in favour of the English peerage, are the sentiments of a man whose imagination, I trust, is not easily dazzled by the glare of opulence, and whose spirit, I am certain, never shrunk from the frowns of power. From the natural progression of those causes which diffuse industry and wealth through society, inequalities will arise, and, having arisen, they will lead to distinctions of some kind or other. But to me it seems that, in the circumstances by which the peers of England are separated from other citizens, and in those by which they are connected with them, feudal institutions have been so tempered and modified by the progress of civilization, and the diffusion of general liberty, as to justify every impartial well-wisher of his country, in resisting all attempts to facilitate the subversion of peerage. Lord Bacon has wisely ascribed the imperfections of the Turkish government to the want of a nobility; and the history of our own kingdom in the last century exhibits a striking proof that the despotism of republicans, like the despotism of monarchs, is more wild and more mischievous, when uncontrolled by that power to which our forefathers were eventually indebted for much of their freedom, and which, if properly regulated, is more likely to preserve than to endanger our own. By the law of the state, nobles are protected as our equals, and, by

tion of their own rights. I have no doubts as to the wisdom, or as to the justice, or as to the expediency, of these alterations. There are, indeed, some subordinate and doubtful points of reformation, about which, ingenuity has lavished conjecture,

---

the law of opinion, they would cease to be our superiors, if they should ever presume to violate the established rules of civilized life.

The manners of Europe, which form so large a part of our social duty and social happiness, originated chiefly among the nobility of Europe. And even in the more improved and more equalized state of society, numerous gradations of rank are necessary to preserve those sentiments which soften the ruggedness of human character, and teach every man at once to respect the dignity of others, and to support his own. As the force of this sentiment is evidently weakened in the lower classes of the community, so, perhaps, in the opposite extremity, it is in some degree invigorated by the distance between our gentry and the noblesse, and the yet wider distance between the noblesse and the crown. Refinement generally descends from the higher to the lower ranks, and its progress seems to be facilitated by the authority of illustrious example, and by the necessity which custom imposes upon us to recognize that pre-eminence, which is fixed by a known rule, and ditinguished by an appropriate name. But the habit, however it may be formed, embraces all the objects to which opinion has attached respect.

I doubt whether those who would destroy peerage be disposed to endure monarchy in any form; and I am sure that they who would extend English liberty upon the principles of the English constitution, will be careful not to drive a powerful order of men, upon principles of self-preservation, into such a confederacy with the crown as may prove injurious to that liberty. Upon the moral influence of nobility, I refer the philosophical reader to Dr. Dunbar's most elegant and masterly Essay on the hereditary genius of Nations.

controversy has bandied arguments, and zeal has fulminated invectives, with little propriety and with little effect. But, when causes of greater pith and moment are in agitation, and when their effects are on the point of bursting upon our sight from every quarter, I would chain up all the little busy and fretful passions, that hurry partizans into enquiries which have no clue, and into altercations which have scarcely any aim. To the mighty decision of experience I leave the ultimate event; not, indeed, without a fearful sense of the uncertainty which impends over all the judgments and all the affairs of men; nor yet, without a high and animating affiance, that partial evils will at last work together for the general good, that the noblest powers of the human mind will be called into action, and that the public stock of human happiness will be secured and enlarged.*

* My general opinions and general wishes upon the subject of the French Revolution, cannot be more luminously expressed than in the words of a writer whose taste, whose erudition, whose philosophical habits of thinking, and whose manly zeal in the cause of rational freedom, have excited the admiration of all Europe:

"Feliciores aliis illi populi, qui imperio ad quamcunque tandem formulam constituto, sed circumscripto illo, utuntur, ut regnantium libido coercita sit bonis legibus et institutis, utque meliora de republica, civium salute, populi juribus, per primores saltem, sparsa sint ac vulgata judicia. Atque in hac felicitate nos quidem ita acquiescimus, ut bonis votis prosequamur alios populos, quos eo adhuc loco constitutos esse voluit Providentia, ut libertatem, hoc est, ut justis finibus circumscriptum ac legibus æquis firmatum imperium curis ac consiliis, virtute et constantia sua, consequantur."—Heyne's Prolusio Academica, spoken at Gottingen, 16th Sept. 1789.

But whatever may be the opinions I hold, as to the justice of the late revolution in France, I have ever distinguished most carefully, and ever most earnestly intreated other men to distinguish between the miseries formerly endured in that country, and the blessings now diffused through our own. In France, the government was morbid in its aspect, morbid in its extremities, and morbid in its vitals; and as to a constitution, the very remains of it have so long been mouldering in the grave, that even the monumental records of what it was, are almost effaced from the page of history; and the philanthropist vainly searches for the fatal spot, on which he may shed a tear of pity over the sacred shade of murdered freedom—I call not the shrunken and shapeless skeleton of authority preserved in the French parliaments, exceptions to this general observation. But in England, we have less to fear from the malignity of any distemper which may arise in the government, than from the unskilfulness or the rapacity of the physicians; and of our constitution it cannot be unsafe to say, that radically it is sound and vigorous, and that hitherto it has exhibited no very alarming symptoms of rapid decay.

The excellence of all governments, said a great philosophical statesmen (Mr. Fox), is relative. But to comprehend relations where they are numerous, to separate them where they are complex, and to adjust them where they are discordant, is the province only of a few enlightened men; and well does it become those who may at any time undertake the stupendous work of reformation, to explore all the

difficulties, and all the dangers which hang over it, to purify their own minds from the polluting dregs of vulgar prejudice, and the intoxicating vapours of "science, falsely so called," to judge of every question without partiality, and to proceed in every measure without precipitation. I do not, indeed, believe those who are now in power, with all their glittering talents, and all their gallant professions, to be such men. But such men may, at this moment, be found in this country with little difficulty, and with little hazard of confutation, I could point them out by name.

> O yet a nobler task awaits your hand,
> (For what can war but endless war still breed?)
> Till truth and right from violence be freed,
> And public faith clear'd from the shameful brand
> Of public fraud.

Upon the first perusal of Mr. Burke's book, I felt, like many other men, its magic force; and, like many other men, I was at last delivered from the illusions which had "cheated my reason," and borne me on from admiration to assent. But, though the dazzling spell be now dissolved, I still remember with pleasure the gay and celestial visions, when my "mind in sweet madness was robbed of itself." I still look back with a mixture of pity and holy awe to the wizard himself, who, having lately broken his wand in a start of phrensy, has shortened the term of his sorceries; and of drugs so potent to "bathe the spirits in delight," I must still acknowledge, that many were culled from the choicest and "most virtuous plants" of Paradise itself.

That the maladies of France had reached almost the last stages of malignity, and threatened a speedy dissolution of all government, it were folly to controvert. The very act of calling the third estate, is a proof that the paltry tricks of political cunning, and the ordinary resources of political wisdom, were quite exhausted. The members of that Assembly exceeded, I grant, the limits of their original commission. But, after every hardy assertion, and every wily misrepresentation to the contrary, it still remains to be proved, that, by confining themselves within the limits of that commission, they would have discharged all of the momentous duties for which they were appointed, or that, being dissolved and sent back to their constituents in consequence of their avowed inefficiency, they would again have been summoned when invested with new powers, and probably for new purposes. If then the plea of necessity be admitted, as it often is, for occasional relaxation, or occasional rigour, in the course of administering governments, I see not why the same plea should, in all cases, be contemptuously scouted in the most arduous work of reforming them. Every great cause involves in itself some properties, which cannot be yoked by the common forms of interpretation. Every great situation is attended by circumstances too inflexible to be controlled by the authority of precedent. Were the representatives of the English nation commissioned to introduce septennial parliaments? No: but novelty has thriven to the full growth of cus-

:om, and usurpation has dropped its terrors under :he sanction of public acquiescence.

With Mr. Burke I most heartily concur, in ad- niring the prudence and the calmness of those llustrious statesmen who in this country conducted he Revolution: and, in opposition to all the ashionable complaints which have lately been rged against them, I am persuaded, like Mr. Burke, that, by attempting to do more, they would ave shaken the stability, and sullied the lustre of hat which they have already done well for them- elves and for posterity. But the circumstances of England and France, at the eras of their respective evolutions, were so different, that what in the one would have been rash, may in the other be neces- ary. In England the throne was vacant: in France it was full. In England the primary spring of all public measures was to supply the vacancy: n France the heavy pressure of the regal power logged the first efforts of reformation, and the ma- hinery of the prevailing system was so complex, hat neither patriotism nor policy could any longer egulate its motions. In England a Bill of Rights vas prepared, which provided chiefly against such lisorders as had sprung up in a few preceding eigns: in France the evil had grown from age to ge in bulk and in strength; it had spread through . wider range; it had borne more baneful fruit; he root of it struck down to Tartarus, and its top owered almost into the skies. In England the laims of the crown were resented as usurpations, r dreaded as novelties: in France they were sys-

tematized into principle, and sanctified by custom. In England the mischiefs which more immediately called for a remedy endangered a good government. In France they almost constituted a government completely bad. In England despotism was an excrescence, which deformed only the surface of the state. In France it was a canker, which preyed upon the vitals. Upon the question whether James should be recalled or William raised to the Throne, the opinions and attachments of men were in England divided in proportions nearly equal. Upon the question whether some form or other of a new government should be planned in France, some experiment be made, which the existing laws did not entirely warrant, some improvements attempted, which must wear the appearance of innovation, there was almost one heart and voice.

All I mean to suggest by these remarks is, that Mr. Burke has been less successful than he usually is in his choice of an instance to illustrate his objections to the new government of France. For, in his general opinion upon the political and moral importance of caution and moderation, he commands my firm and most sincere assent.

While Mr. Burke contends in favour of a limited monarchy, they who dissent from him more widely than I do, exult in the prospect of a mitigated and polished democracy, veiled under the more decent aspect of a mixed government. But with a leaning, I fairly confess, in my wishes toward a more solid substance, and a more magnificent form of monarchy, than have lately appeared in France, I

annot subscribe to the black catalogue of crimes hich Mr. Burke has charged upon all the motives, nd upon all the measures, of the National Assemly, often without discrimination, and sometimes, I hink, without proof. The native candour of his wn mind would not permit him to include every ember of the Assembly in his calendar of villainy; nd his exalted wisdom surely will now induce him o confess, that in the virtues of a few there is ometimes a latent and resistless energy to curb he violence of the many. I have already enumeated some regulations, which, as a philanthropist, Ir. Burke may survey without a pang, and which, s a loyalist, he may without a blush commend. But, since the publication of his two great works, ll Europe has been a witness of an awful scene, in hich the reformers of France have shaken off very odious imputation which may have clung to heir characters as being unprincipled traitors, or nfeeling murderers. When good men shuddered t the possible consequences of the capture of the rench sovereign; when, by turns, amazement verwhelmed and pity melted the mind of every listant spectator; when the haughty and inexorable dvocates for regicidal tenets shrunk on the nearer pproach of that spectre of vengeance which their maginations had arrayed in the robe of justice; hen it was that the genius of France arose, and ed in its train all the virtues which adorn the citiæn and the man; compassion, gallantry, generoity, loyalty, a sense of private honour, and a sense of public duty. Then started up that determined

phalanx of moderate men, whose vigour and whose wisdom arrested the impending storm; whose interposition, I trust, would again uphold the state if it should again reel with any new convulsions; and whose influence at this moment silently controuls the jargon of visionary demagogues, and the machinations of factious clubs. These were men such as the unsettled and perilous state of France required; men whose virtues were set in motion, and in appearance brought into being, by the shocks of empires; and who, in the midst of havock and disorder, by their authority struck down bad citizens with awe, and by their counsels hushed the warring elements of passion and interest into peace.

They know the times and the seasons. They have obtained a mastery over those petty and froward humours which fester in debate and rankle in the closet. They soil not the purity and splendour of genius by exposing it too often to the garish eye of day. Disdaining to chace the caprices of public opinion, and to catch the momentary gale of public favour, they seize the public strength by force, and wield the public confidence by one mighty effort for one mighty purpose. They reverence their country in their laws, and their king they reverence for the sake of both. Their moderation, assisted by wisdom and magnanimity, teaches them what to suffer, what to prevent, when to forbear, and when to interpose. Their importance, instead of being squandered upon the fleeting occurrences of the passing day, is hoarded up for great occasions, where it may be felt as well as seen. Their

courage is not dissipated in wanton attack, but collected for firm resistance. Their ambition is not tarnished by any baser alloy of vanity. Their conscious rectitude looks for its reward, not in the plaudits of a tumultuous senate, or of a giddy populace, but in the calm and approving judgment of distant nations, and of a grateful posterity.

Happy were it for France if, between these moderate men, who do honour to the new government, and the more enlightened friends of the old, some communication could be opened, and some alliance effected. By mutual concession they might reconcile the jarring claims of the contending parties. By mutual forbearance they might heal the wounds of their bleeding country. By uniting the influence of all good men, collected from all parties, they might crush the pretensions and blast the designs of those adventurers who would deluge France with slaughter, whether they be patriots plotting for anarchy, or loyalists struggling for despotism. But such an auspicious change is hardly to be expected, while a Calonne broods over his intrigues, while a Bouillé hurls his menaces, and while the surmises and the reproaches of angry disputants keep asunder those worthy persons by whose union alone change can be accomplished.

It is not my design, be it observed, to engage as a professed champion in the controversy upon the affairs of France; and, indeed, I was led in this pamphlet to the first mention of them by personal rather than political considerations. Had I meant to appear as the antagonist or the advocate of Mr.

Burke, (and in any elaborate composition I must have occasionally been both,) I should have felt it a duty to him and to the public to explore those mines of political and historical knowledge from which he and his opponents have drawn their materials. Some of the books containing that knowledge have fallen, perhaps, within the circle of my reading; and some portion of the information they contain is not wholly beyond the grasp of my humble abilities. But I have touched, and I meant only to touch, upon these topics incidentally. However, having ventured to express some difference in opinion from a man esteemed so virtuous and so wise, I thought myself bound, in one instance, to assign my reasons; and with the same sentiments of habitual reverence for the same eminent writer, I shall take the liberty of glancing at two other subjects, on which I have not the happiness entirely to agree with him. The points to which I allude are, the indignant distinction which Mr. Burke has set up between theory and practice, and the ardent wish which he expresses for a combination of European potentates against the National Assembly of France. What I have to say upon the first will, I fear, be thought dry and uninteresting by many readers; while, in my opinion, every mistake of such a man as Mr. Burke deserves serious examination, and derives an uncommon, degree of importance from the uncommon and indeed the matchless talents of the writer himself.

Indolence often reposes, and declamation triumphs, in vagrant propositions, which are repeated

o frequently, and advanced so confidently, that to ispute them carries the appearance of presumptu- us paradox. Thus we are told of many political axims, that they are at once true in theory and lse in practice. But this union of truth and false- ood in the same doctrine, applied to the same ubject, is impossible; and the allegation of false- ood, when the doctrine refers to different subjects, s wholly impertinent as absurd. It shews only, hat the doctrine does not include what it was ever meant to include, without proving that what it loes include, deserves the imputation of being false. All truth consists in the relation of our ideas to each other, or in the conformity of those ideas to external objects; and wheresoever that relation or that conformity exists, the ideas belonging to either are unalterably just; and the proposition express- ing those ideas must for ever be true. If, there- fore, a proposition be true in theory, it must, if made up of the same ideas, be equally true in prac- tice, real or supposed, where the practice is corre- spondent to the theory; and where it is not corre- spondent, no honest man would profess to argue without discrimination from the one to the other. Between propositions belonging to theory, and those that belong to practice, there indeed is often a close resemblance, but not a specific identity; and from that resemblance, probably, arises the opinion that what is true in one may be false in the other. But in this case the proposition belong- ing to practice, and the proposition belonging to theory, are distinct and independent. Each may

be true when applied to its proper subject, and each may be false when applied to any other subject. The imperfection, however, lies not in the proposition itself, but in the application; and the falsehood, to speak correctly, is to be found, not in the principle of the theory, but in the assumption that some given case rests upon the same principles. Mr. Paley has very ably shewn the dependence of our moral opinions and moral conduct upon general rules; and Mr. Hume justly observes, that the chief difficulty lies in the art of applying those rules to the discovery of what is true, and to the observance of what is right, in particular instances.

Now theory is a general collection of inferences drawn from facts and compressed into principles. When, therefore, practice and theory are said to clash, we are not always to maintain that the theory is generally false, but that it does not include or provide for some particular case, to which it has been erroneously and injudiciously applied. The theory may be correct and comprehensive, though inapplicable to subjects which prejudice or passion has associated with it. Unusual is it for men to say that what is true in practice is false in theory; and yet this position, though less familiar to our ears, is not more inadmissible to our understandings than the converse, that what is true in theory is false in practice. All practice may not be reduced to theory; but all theory professing to be founded upon practice, and claiming the right to regulate it, is true or probable so far only as it is supported by experience.

Again, Mr. Burke says, (p. 91, 92,) that some modern theories upon the rights of men, "though metaphysically true, are morally and politically false." But aware as I am, in common with a great poetical dialectician, (Dryden,) and, indeed, with every novice in the art of logic, that "fallacies often live in universals," I cannot accede to Mr. Burke's observation. True or false are the expressions of the metaphysical properties belonging to any proposition upon the rights of men. Proper or improper, and just or unjust, are the expressions of the moral properties. Useful or pernicious are the expressions of the political properties. In conformity to these distinctions, I should say that many parts of Mr. Paine's theory about the rights of men are false, when traced up into metaphysical abstraction; are unjust, when referred to moral obligations; are pernicious, when measured by political expediency; or, in other words, the theory itself is false, because it does not correspond to practice, which it professes to regulate. But, while I reprobate some of Mr. Paine's opinions about the rights of man, I, like Mr. Burke, (p. 86,) do not in theory deny the existence of man's rights; and in practice my heart is as far as Mr. Burke's, or Mr. Paine's, from wishing any one of his real rights to be withholden.

Much, however, as in various instances I may condemn the language of Mr. Paine upon the rights of men, I cannot dissemble my concern at the "dreadful notes of preparation," which have been lately sounded by kings about the rights of kings.

The book of an individual has little or no weight,

except what it derives from argument; and argument, if fallacious, may be refuted, or, if mischievous, may be counteracted by better arguments in a better cause. But when kings proceed to harangue in public and official documents upon the rights of kings, they speak in a tone of authority which is not to be slighted. The line of distinction is said to be already drawn by two foreign courts between kings and subjects, nay, between kings and men; between those who have no right to govern but as they protect, and those who are under no obligation to obey but as they are protected; between those who neither govern nor protect the French, and those who in France are governed and protected by laws of their own, and a king of their own.

> "For now sits expectation in the air,
> And hides a sword from hilt unto the point
> With crowns imperial, crowns and coronets,
> Promis'd to Louis and their followers."
>
> SHAKSP. Henry V.

But in opposition to all the pleas of interference from the other powers of Europe, let Frenchmen, says common justice, decide the affairs of France. "Bella viri pacemque gerant queis bella gerenda."

For many of the French noblesse, "who worshipped," as Mr. Burke most beautifully says, "their country in the person of their king," and whose blood," as Shakspeare says, not less beautifully, "is fetched from fathers of war proof," I have a sincere veneration. Nor would I hastily and indiscriminately condemn the principle by which some

of them are actuated in attempting a counter-revolution. The end may be honourable, though the means are execrable, and would lead, in the present case, not so much to the re-establishment of the monarchy in France, as to the extirpation of freedom throughout Europe. In respect then to the menaces of foreign powers, I must say with Mr. Burke, (p. 59,) that "the arguments of tyranny are as contemptible as its force is dreadful."

After all the intrigues of politics, all the devastations of war, and all the barbarous excesses of despotism which disgrace the annals of mankind, the black and lowering storm which threatens soon to overspread the face of all Europe, and to overwhelm in one common ruin every loose remnant and every faint vestige of liberty, constitutes a spectacle equally new and tremendous.

Even the tenets of Mr. Paine himself are yet less novel in theory, and yet less pernicious in practice, than the counsels of those sanguinary fanatics, who would unblushingly and unfeelingly rouse the unsparing sword of foreign potentates, and point it without provocation, without precedent, without any other plea than will, without any other end than tyranny, against the bosoms of Frenchmen contending with Frenchmen alone, upon French ground alone, about French rights, French laws, and French government alone.

When it is urged that princes, from their relation to princes, have a common cause, and a cause, too, it is meant, virtually paramount to the rights of subjects and of men, the obvious answer is, that

they who are not princes have also a common cause, and the obvious consequence of that answer is, that if they are true to themselves, to their neighbours, and to their posterity, confederacy is to rise up against confederacy, and deluge the world with blood. Τοὺς γὰρ τὰς πολιτείας καταλυόντας, καὶ μεθισταντας εἰς τυράννιδα, κοινοὺς ἐχθροὺς παραιτῶ νομίζειν πάντων τῶν ἐλευθερίας ἐπιθυμούντων.—Demosth. de Libertate Rhod.

If indeed the threatened crusade of ruffian despots should be attempted, it will, in my opinion, be an outrageous infringement upon the laws of nations; it will be a savage conspiracy against the written and the unwritten rights of mankind; and, therefore, in the sincerity of my soul, I pray the righteous Governor of the Universe, the Creator of men, and the King of Kings, I pray Him to abate the pride, to assuage the malice, and to confound all the devices, of all the parties, directly or indirectly leagued in this complicated scene of guilt and horror—This insult upon the dignity of human nature itself—This treason against the majesty of God's own image, rational and immortal man.

As to myself, and to others who, like myself, express the terror and just abhorrence which they feel at this most unparalleled measure, when we are scornfully asked why we express those feelings, we shall find our answer in Mr. Burke's philanthropy opposed to Mr. Burke's politics (p. 9, of his Appeal): "Is it inhuman to prevent, if possible, the spilling of Frenchmen's blood, or imprudent to guard against the effusion of our own," and in a cause, I will add, which, while Englishmen are Englishmen,

never can be our own? For is it possible that by the intrigues of courts, by the sophistry of ministers, or by the futile and hollow pleas of a guarantee * in one place, and of alliance in another, the free-born descendants of free-born fathers can be persuaded to endure one tax, to unsheath one sword, to fall in with one measure, in opposition to the precious and sacred interests of general liberty?

Μὴ δῆτα, μὴ δῆτ', ὦ θεῶν ἁγνὸν σέβας,
Ἴδοιμι ταύτην ἡμέραν. ŒD. TYR. v. 830.

Unless our constitution be, as dying Brutus said of virtue, "an empty name," by the very spirit of that constitution, and by the force of a compact, more solemn and more binding than the ties of any treaty woven in any cabinet, Britons eminently are, what the Athenians professed to be, the κοινοὶ προστάται τῆς πάντων ἐλευθερίας, the guarantees of freedom itself, and the allies of all free men, throughout all the world:

"And, when they frown, it is against th' oppressor,
And not against the French." SHAK. Rich. II.

The people of England, I am sure, then, are too gallant to engage in a war against such a nation, in such circumstances. The parliament of England is too enlightened to approve of a war. The king of England is far too wise, too humane, too magnanimous, to propose a war.

But, warmly as I would oppose the project of Mr.

* I believe that England is fortunately not fettered as guarantee for Brabant. Thanks to the pride or the suspicion of the Emperor Leopold, rather than to the foresight or the moderation of Chancellor Pitt.

Burke for the French monarchy to be restored by the exertion of kings, who, unless they have degenerated into tyrants, can have no real interest in its restoration, I sometimes pause in uncertainty, and sometimes shudder with fear, when the proceedings in France are holden up as a perfect model for imitation * in England.

Different † are the two nations in their manners

---

* Ράδιον μὲν γὰρ πόλιν σεῖ-
-σαί καὶ τοῖς ἀφαυροτέροις· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ χώ-
-ρας αὖθις ἔσσαι δυσπαλές
Δὴ γίνεται ἐξαπίνας,
Εἰ μὴ Θεὸς ἀγεμόνεσσι κυβερ-
-νατὴρ γένηται. PINDAR. Pyth. 4.

† The same differences which make it unsafe for the English to imitate the French, may surely justify the French in not modelling their new constitution by that of England. The general principles of liberty admit various modifications; and they who look for the causes of our own freedom, not in books of speculation, but in our history, and in our laws, will ascribe no small share of it to accident as well as design; to events which human wisdom slowly improved, but rarely foresaw; to force as well as compact; to concessions sometimes obtained by the interposition of parliament, and sometimes extorted directly from reluctant tyrants by the just and loud demands of their indignant subjects. If we could investigate the origin of those imperfect and precarious rights which the inhabitants of many other European countries have from time to time been able to wring from their feudal despots, we should find them indebted, even for the loose and unshaken fragments of their liberties, to the weakness rather than the justice, to the fears rather than to the virtues, and even to the craftiness rather than to the wisdom, of the ruling powers. Machiavel's system of artifice, and Hobbes's system of power, contain the principles which have really actuated the councils of too many princes. But happy is our own country in our own times, when the moderation of him who governs, the noble and gene-

and their prejudices, different in the privileges of their peerage, and in the rights of their commonalty; different in the power claimed, and the powers exercised by their kings; different in the forms of their government, and the principles of their constitution; different in their modes of religion, and even in their propensity to irreligion, I hope, very different. Keen, therefore, would be my vigilance, and stubborn my reluctance, in applying to the affairs of England those theories which are said to have been purely and completely realized in the new government of France. But, attached as I am, firmly and unfeignedly to the fundamental maxims of the English constitution, I must confess, that not one of the late publications has given me the satis-

rous nature of him who is to succeed, and the strengh of those who obey, leave us not much to apprehend from either of those systems, if our vigilance be proportionate to our duty. Obscure and scattered as may be the causes of our liberty, we see distinctly, and feel experimentally, their aggregate and beneficial effects. Let us then (as Mr. Hume says, Essay 4,) "cherish and improve as much as possible our antient constitution, without encouraging a passion for dangerous novelties." On the other hand, let us consider that "he whose office is to govern a supine or an abject people, cannot for a moment cease to extend his power. Every execution of the law, every movement of the state, every civil and military operation in which his power is concerned, must serve to confirm his authority, and present him to the view of the public as the sole object of consideration, fear, and respect. Those very establishments which were devised in one age to limit or to direct the exercise of the executive power, will serve in another to remove obstructions and to smooth its way. They will point out the channels in which it may run, without giving offence, or without exciting alarms."—Ferguson on the History of Civil Society, chap. vi. sect. 5.

faction, which at this crisis I anxiously wish to receive. Some writers, I observe, have turned our attention only to the darker side of government, scaring us with evils, which, I trust, have no existence, foreboding evils, which, I hope, never will exist, and exaggerating evils, which every impartial man will acknowledge and lament. Others have affected to wrap up in artificial mystery * all the

* "A high Tory," says Johnson, "makes government unintelligible:" but I will quote the whole passage, because I assent to almost every part of it, and because there is no part which does not contain judicious remarks and useful information.

"A wise Tory and a wise Whig, I believe, will agree; their principles are the same, though their modes of thinking are different. A high Tory makes government unintelligible; it is lost in the clouds. A violent Whig makes it impracticable; he is for allowing so much liberty to every man, that there is not power enough to govern any man. The prejudice of the Tory is for establishment. The prejudice of the Whig is for innovation. A Tory does not wish to give more real power to government, but that government should have more reverence. Then they differ as to the church. The Tory is not for giving more legal power to the clergy, but wishes they should have a considerable influence founded on the opinion of mankind: the Whig is for limiting and watching them with a narrow jealousy." —Page 400, Boswell.

I insert this passage in consequence of Mr. Burke's remark, (page 113 of his Appeal,) that the British constitution is of too high an order of excellence to be adapted to common minds. This surely resembles what Johnson said of the Tory. But between men of shallow and superficial understandings, and men to whom Mr. Burke would allow wisdom and reflection, there is a numerous class of citizens, whose doubts deserve consideration. Possessing a common share of judgment, improved by the common advantages of education, they are not incapable of understanding "many of the views which our constitution takes in, and many of the combinations which it

powerful ties by which the government of the country is connected with its prosperity; and preferring the haughtiness of dogmatism to the drudgery of proof, they would drive away the eyes of the profane from contemplating those causes, which all have a right to examine, because all are daily and hourly interested in their effects. But this kind of language carries with it neither the plausibility of theory nor the solidity of fact. It may confound, but it will never convince. It may lull men for a time into supineness and insensibility, but will neither gratify their curiosity, nor allay their terrors, in the hour of danger. Unquestionably, the spirit of enquiry is gone forth; and my hope is, that it may take a right direction, and lead us, as well to value and to perpetuate the blessings which we now enjoy, as to obtain, through the concurrence of good government with good citizens, other and greater blessings, if, indeed, other and greater blessings are placed within our reach.

From the incidental mention of these subjects which have been discussed by Mr. Burke and Mr. Paine, and upon which I would be understood to state my opinions, without assigning the reasons for which I hold them, I will take occasion to inform the reader of the effect, which I have felt from a third celebrated writer, to whom the attention of the public has been very much directed.

---

makes." They would recognize it, "with the less enquiring in their feelings and their experience;" and, assisted by such profound thinkers as Mr. Burke, they would also "know it in its reason and in its spirit."

In the rapid and eccentric notions of Mr. Burke's mind through the vast and trackless spaces of politics, it often loses the power of attraction upon my own; and as to Mr. Paine,* upon my first approach

* The part of Mr. Paine's book which interested and convinced me the most is, the very able narrative which he gives of the progress and circumstances of the revolution at Paris: but I cannot suffer "one truth," as Dryden says, "to support a thousand lying rhymes," upon abstract politics. I recognize in Mr. Paine a mind not disciplined by early education, not softened and refined by a various and extensive intercourse with the world, not enlarged by the knowledge which books supply; but endowed by nature with very great vigour, and strengthened by long and intense habits of reflection. Acute he appears to me, but not comprehensive; and bold, but not profound. Of man, in his general nature he seems only to have grasped a part, and of man as distinguished by local and temporary circumstances, his views are indistinct and confined. His notions of government are therefore too partial for theory, and too novel for practice, and, under a fair semblance of simplicity, conceals a mass of most dangerous errors.

"For dignity composed, and high exploit
He seems. His pen can make the worse appear
The better reasons. But his thoughts are *low*."

In plain truth, I understand more by the English word "crown," than "a bauble kept in the Tower to be shown for twelvepence;" nor do I consider aristocracy "as having but one child; as begetting the rest to be devoured, and then throwing them to the canibal for prey." The parent, whom Mr. Paine describes as so unnatural, is at least an affectionate nurse during the infancy of her offspring; she feeds it carefully, and clothes it warmly, before she turns it loose into the wide world. But, to drop figurative language, the younger children of our nobility receive the same liberal education with the elder; and to me it seems that, instead of subdividing in all cases a large fortune among those whom Mr. Paine's law

towards him, I was instantly repelled to an unmeasurable distance, and for a time was content to view

---

would make equal, but whom nature has not made equal in corporeal and intellectual strength, and whom the equal expectation of independence would, according to their different capacities, make yet more unequal, it were better policy for them to be trusted with the creation of their own fortune by their own merits in the army, in the navy, in the church, and at the bar. Perhaps in a commercial country it were well if the old feudal prejudices of the noblesse against commerce were extirpated, as partnership would supply the want of a large capital, and the families of nobility would gradually be blended in opinion and interest with the industrious classes of the community. But without the aid of formal discussion, one plain tale shall put down Mr. Paine's strutting metaphor. Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt are the younger sons of noblemen. As to the priesthood, I have seen it ridiculed with wit much keener than Mr. Paine's in the works of Trenchard and Gordon, and with eloquence more magnificent than Mr. Paine's, in the prose writings of Milton. I mean not, however, to palliate the prejudices of the clergy; and my opportunities for observing their causes and their effects have not been fewer, I suppose, than Mr. Paine's. But I also know their personal virtues; I know their usefulness in society; I know that, in this country, they upon the whole are a most enlightened and valuable order of citizens; and in saying so I am not much influenced by selfish motives, as Mr. Paine would probably allow, if he were acquainted with the obscurity of my ecclesiastical station, and the scantiness of my ecclesiastical income. I am not well enough informed about the internal state of America to determine how far Mr. Paine's opinions may be useful there, in a nascent government. But when I consider the progress of arts, sciences, literature, and politics, law, and religion, in the settled governments of Europe, I suspect that, by the plan of Mr. Paine, instead of advancing to a more improved state of society, we should find ourselves retrograde towards that situation which is commonly called a state of nature, or, at least,

him, as philosophers look through a telescope at some dim and sullen planet, whose orbit is at the remotest extremity from the center. But in the middle and more temperate path which Mr. Mackintosh has generally pursued, I could often accompany him with pleasure; for, like the earth in the solar system, he seems neither to approach too near to the dazzling fountain of light, nor to recede from it too far. My friend, for I have the honour to hail him by that splendid name, will excuse me for expressing in general terms what I think of his work.*

In Mackintosh, then, I see the sternness of a republican without his acrimony, and the ardour of a reformer without his impetuosity. His taste in morals, like that of Mr. Burke, is equally pure and delicate with his taste in literature. His mind is so

---

that we should sacrifice many of the brilliant and indisputable advantages which make us boast of living in a civilized and enlightened age. Quotation is my trade, and therefore I will not suppress some lines which I once applied to the American reformers of English politics:

Protect us, mighty Providence;
What would these madmen have?
First they would bribe us without pence,
Deceive us without common sense,
And without power enslave.

The lines were written in 1680, and are worth remembering in 1792.

* The age of the writer, the merit of his first publication, and the reception it has met with from the world, induce me to apply to my friend what Cicero said of Hortensius: "Quinti Hortensii admodum adolescentis ingenium, ut Phidiæ signum, simul adspectum et probatum est."—Cic. de Orat. lib. ii.

comprehensive, that generalities cease to be barren, and so vigorous, that detail itself becomes interesting. He introduces every question with perspicuity, states it with precision, and pursues it with easy and unaffected method. Sometimes, perhaps, he may amuse his readers by excursions into paradox; but he never bewilders them by flights into romance. His philosophy is far more just, and far more amiable than the philosophy of Paine, and his eloquence is only not equal to the eloquence of Mr. Burke. He is argumentative without sophistry, fervid without fury, profound without obscurity, and sublime without extravagance.

My friend, I am sure, does not suspect me of wishing for the return of "that priestly craft, and priestly domination which would certainly re-plunge Europe into ignorance and superstition." But he will excuse me for pronouncing a most decided and a most unqualified negative to the assumption of the National Assembly, that "the existence of ranks* is repugnant to the social union." On the

* Mr. Mackintosh does not forget, that in the Roman republic there were distinctions of rank not merely among the patricians, knights, and plebeians, but among the nobiles and novi. "Hereditary characteristics attracted the attention of mankind in some degree under all the antient governments."—Dunbar, on the hereditary Genius of Nations. See Dr. Taylor's Element's of Civil Law, p. 179.

Among the Lacedæmonians there were personal distinctions of rank, though not hereditary, and the Greek word exactly corresponds to our English word peers. See Xenophon, Hellenic. lib. iii. cap. 3. p. 35. edit. Xunius, where the note is worth consulting. See also Palmerii Exercitationes, p. 69.

contrary, I am persuaded that hereditary as well as personal distinctions may, under a wise legislature, become the instruments of public good, and that without bringing back the rude state of society, which gave rise to the nobility * of Europe, a principle of virtuous action already excited (for I contend that it is excited) by the feudal institutions, may be adapted to the exigencies of a more enlightened and more civilized age.

Again, I totally differ from my friend upon the origin and the tenure of ecclesiastical property, and in his description of ecclesiastics as mere pensioners of the state.—He knows me too well, I am sure, to impute this dissent to the weakness and the selfishness of professional prejudice. But these, and a few other defects, if defects they be, are lost in the blaze

---

Mr. Hume, in his Essays, has often observed the similarity between the French and the Athenians; but he did not expect that in so few years after his death, so striking and new an instance of resemblance would arise, as we have lately seen in the language of the public assemblies—Frenchmen, is now the simple and dignified mode of address in the national assembly, like men of Athens, in the Greek orators.

But the mode in which they often address the king of the French, reminds me of the words which the grand justiciary, or head of the Ricos Hombres, was content to use once to the king of Arragon: "We, who are your equals, constitute you our Lord and King, on condition that you maintain our privileges and liberties; if otherwise, not."—See Millot's Elements of General History, vol. i. p. 195; and Sidney's Discourses, chap. ii. sect. 5.

* "Some decent, regulated pre-eminence, some preference (not exclusive appropriation) given to birth, is neither unnatural, nor unjust, nor impolitic."—P. 76, Burke's Reflections.

of general excellence; and they who reflect upon the just and luminous comparison which Mr. Mackintosh has drawn between the peers of France and those of England, may, upon farther consideration, be led to other solid and useful distinctions, upon other momentous and awful topics.

My meaning will be understood, when I say, that I prefer two independent houses for legislative deliberation to one, and that in a king with the substance of the executive power, will be found a better guardian of the public weal than in the mockery of a pageant king with little more than the shadow.

My opinion upon the sacred duties and the venerable privileges of an English King nearly coincide with those of Mr. Rous, and I am happy in this opportunity of acknowledging the pleasure I received from his late excellent letter to Mr. Burke. I am, however, compelled to dissent from this very judicious and patriotic writer, upon the extent to which he would stretch his principle of excluding the members of the legislative body from all share whatsoever in the duties and the emoluments of the executive government. I grant, indeed, that the more useful duties in the lower departments are well enough discharged by men, "formed by the routine of office.* See p. 104 of Mr. Rous's Letter." But

* That men who are formed, according to Mr. Rous's expression, merely by "the routine of office," can bear up against the pressure of public duties and public difficulties, I deny as a fact. And upon this subject I think the following remarks of Mr. Ferguson deserving of serious consideration: "When we suppose government to have bestowed a degree of tranquillity,

I cannot admit, that the higher departments stand in no need of "minds splendidly endowed," or that, when such minds engage in public affairs, "their paths are ever marked with ruin." Great revolutions have usually been atchieved by men of great abilities; but their success in turbulent periods is to be imputed to previous circumstances, and those circumstances gradually arise from the want of wisdom in persons who have directed the affairs of government in seasons of apparent tranquillity.

"To settle the imaginary balance of power, to impose a form of government upon one reluctant people, to adjust the limits of dominion to another," are surely not the sole employments for which an English administration is destined. That the attention of our present governors has been too much directed to those narrow and mischievous objects; that their measures, whether successful or defeated,* have been at once expensive without ad-

---

which we sometimes hope to reap from it, as the best of its fruits, and public affairs to proceed in the several departments of legislation and execution, with the least possible interruption to commerce and lucrative arts; when a state, like that of China, throws affairs into separate offices, where conduct consists in detail, and in the observance of forms, it supersedes all the exertions of a great and liberal mind, and is more akin to despotism than we imagine."—Ferguson's Civil Society, part vi. sect. 5.

* In the ridiculous and fruitless contest of this country about the cession of Okzakow, we have seen an instance where, as Bolingbroke says, (Letter 13th, upon Parties,) "the majority without doors compelled the majority within doors to truckle to the minority." Much do I rejoice at the event,

ge, and ostentatious without glory; that they multiplied our taxes without extending our nerce, and have displayed our strength without asing our security, I readily allow. But, whilst nment embraces the affairs, not of Great Bri- nly, but of Ireland, and of those remote colo- which it seems equally difficult to keep and erous to abandon, whilst there is a real as well imaginary balance of power, which every state be concerned in preserving against the en- hments of every other state; whilst our do- ic councils must, for the sake of our domes- afety, be sometimes engaged in watching the

---

ore at the cause. What then, it may be asked, was stacle which prevailed against the votes of parliament, lans of the cabinet, the dark negociations of foreign , the senseless and delusive cry of confidence, and the ing plea of engagements, which, in Bolingbroke's words, ly both action and expence?"—(Patriot King.) My r is, the just and extended views which the English peo- e beginning to entertain upon the folly, the injustice, and nexpediency of war, and which, by a sort of rebound the declaration of the national assembly of France, k upon the public mind with a wider and deeper impres-

A spectacle has been thus spread before the contempla- hilanthropist, such as the history of past times seldom nts to our view, and such as futures historians will, I describe with enthusiasm, and hold up to the wonder and nitation of all succeeding ages. Events yet greater will, ps, ere long burst from the womb of greater causes, and y is that man who, mingling the love of freedom with the of peace and order and social union, surveys with philo- cal calmness or religious awe the gracious designs of Pro- ce, magnificently unfolding themselves in the intellectual, ivil, and the moral improvement of mankind.

crooked machinations, and in curbing the restless ambition, of foreign powers; whilst France is struggling for freedom, and other nations, after the example of France, seem disposed to shake off the yoke of despotism; whilst our public debt is so heavy, and our public interests are so complex and so extensive, the talents which, under such circumstances, aim only at "giving protection to a people," ought to be of no common order. Such, indeed, is the unquiet, and, I believe, unprecedented state of Europe, so dark are the views, so mighty are the preparations, so discordant will be the ultimate interests of the European powers, that it is impossible to name a period in which there was greater occasion for the greatest talents in all the branches of our own government, whether legislative or executive.

No general proposition can be more evident, than that, without talents of considerable magnitude in the persons to whom the task of governing is committed, government itself cannot be either respectable or safe. It cannot, for a long time, direct the public opinion. It cannot employ the public strength to purposes of public utility. I will add, too, that in a free government like our own, talents, if confined, as we have lately seen them, to one minister, are big with danger, though, if diffused through the various members of administration, they would give greater energy and greater dignity to every measure. Surely it is not the excess of abilities in one quarter, but the want of abilities in many quarters, to which every impar-

tial observer will ascribe our late disasters in war, and our present distresses after a long, though most precarious and unsettled, peace. To do evil is more within the reach of every man, in public as well as in private life, than to do good. And if persons of "secondary talents" alone be entrusted, as Mr. Rous wishes them to be, with the executive government, low ambition and low cunning, "wielding the armies and navies of the state," would too often baffle the efforts of that legislative band in whom wisdom is combined with magnanimity.

In the present condition of the world, good men may indeed wish, but wise men will rarely hope, for such a kind and such a degree of public spirit as shall in men of distinguished abilities be wholly separated from views of personal interest. If, indeed, the separation were effected, competition for popularity might split the senate into parties more powerful, and in the end more factious, than those which are formed by competition for office; and the favour of the people would eventually become a more dangerous source of influence than the favour of the sovereign himself. In their appeals to the public judgment, men in all popular states have been "embarrassed with preconceived plans of personal ambition," in the mildest "acceptation of the term," and the greatest talents have been "employed" sometimes "in teaching the way of truth," but much oftener "in perplexing, in confounding, and in spreading a delusive cloud before the eyes of nations." This, indeed, would not have happened, if "their hearts had been purely devoted to the

public interest," but experience forbids us to look for perfection in any number of public men.

Let me not, however, be suspected of insinuating that men of transcendental ability press to the brink of corruption with a more rapid career than those who excite less envy, because they command less admiration. On the contrary, the more natural tendency of great intellectual endowments is, to rescue the heart from the dominion of coarse and selfish passions, and to fix it upon treasures less ignoble and less perishable than paltry pelf, which may be amassed without excellence and possessed without dignity. Even in the ordinary effects of those endowments we see a delicacy and elevation of sentiment, a habit of self-respect, a capacity for self-denial, by which men are happily preserved at least from very servile compliances and very atrocious crimes. To such men, the consciousness of high merit filling the wide expanse of high station, the homage of the opulent, the powerful, and the noble, the music of popular applause, the anticipation of glory in ages yet unborn, nay, the immediate bustle of action itself, supply gratifications far too exquisite to be felt by the sordid slaves of avarice, the grovelling drudges of office, and the venal tools of power. While, therefore, public employments, in which the love of lucre is purified by the love of honour, are conferred upon public men, it can be no disgrace to individuals that genius should not renounce the distinctions to which patient industry, superficial attainments, and even the mere mechanism of intellect, are permitted to

aspire; neither can it promote the general good, that they who are capable of atchieving the least should be exclusively invested with the privilege of receiving the most.

For my part, when I consider the general constitution and operations of the human mind, I am content to derive from the mingled frailties and excellencies of men, those effects which hitherto have not been produced by the influence of firm and steady virtue alone; and I sometimes rejoice to see the impetuosity of rampant ambition restrained by a concomitant passion, which looks, indeed, more immediately for gratification in less brilliant objects, but which clears off much of its own impurity by habitual association with passions of a higher order. When I farther consider the peculiar and distinguishing circumstances of our own country, I am not sorry to find, that through exertion in parliament is laid open an avenue to that public confidence, which usually concurs with causes less honourable in exalting men to employments in the state. But if the profits and the honours of political departments were quite inaccessible to men who would erect their fortune on the basis of their fame, those talents which now range through the wide field of politics would droop and languish in the humbler cells of office, or, being devoted to the views of the sovereign alone, they would be exerted in their utmost force, with little control from the opinions, and little regard to the interests, of the people.

No institutions of man, however solid in their

fundamental principles, and however beneficial in their general tendencies, can be fenced against the incursions of contingent evil. The advantages even of the best regulated monarchy are exposed to some interruption from the inflexible but most salutary rule of hereditary succession. Yet the personal defects of successors may be compensated by the choice of ministers, who have skill "to unfold the drift of haughty and hollow states,"* "to settle" the conditions of "peace," "and to move the main nerves of war, in all its equipage." On the other hand, if men of ordinary talents and ordinary powers huddle around the throne, they whom Bolingbroke calls the "lumber of every administration, and the furniture of every court," will snatch some favourable opportunity of seizing upon the highest offices. But the crown itself, exchanging efficient ministers for agreeable favourites, will be unable to protect the rights of others or to preserve its own. It will be equally unprepared against the treacherous calm and the scowling tempest. It will substitute suspicion for vigilance, obstinacy for steadiness, and laxity for moderation. It will neither accommodate itself to the gradual changes, nor support itself under the sudden revolutions, of public opinion. Its spirit will at one time be abject, and at another supercilious. Its councils will be intricate or wavering, and its measures either languid from debility or violent from unskilfulness. In the mean time, the errors of the sovereign himself will not

* See Milton's Sonnet upon Mr. Henry Lawes.

be corrected, his passions will not be controlled, his caprices will be cherished instead of being overawed, his weaknesses will render him a dupe to the craftiness of his servants, and even his wisdom, or his virtues, will point him out as an object of their jealousy.

While, however, I contend for that "rare commerce,* which gives and takes a lustre from the throne," I allow, with Mr. Rous, that "legislation is a very proper scene for great talents, and that the science of giving protection to mankind is worthy to fill the most extended life."

But my wish is, that the public duties may be discharged by the same men in their legislative and executive capacities, because my opinion is, that, by the concurrence of their general interests, those duties will, upon the whole, be discharged more effectually. Doubtless, the senate, like the vaulted firmament of heaven, should be studded with stars that twinkle, and stars that blaze, of every size, and in every direction. But, if in our political system, the crown may, with any semblance of propriety, be compared to Jupiter, the first of planets in magnitude; let it not be made the least in glory, nor deprived of the radiance it may borrow from its satellites.

Happy should I be, if the catalogue of useless and expensive places in this kingdom were much abridged; if the number of placemen eligible to parliament were fixed by parliamentary authority itself;

* Young's Satire 7th.

if the offices they should be capable of holding were specified by some known and standing rule, and if those offices were confined, strictly confined, to the most active, the most useful, the most arduous, and therefore, with justice the most profitable parts of the executive government. But as for the total separation for which Mr. Rous contends, and for which I remember myself to have been an advocate some years ago, I despair of some of the good consequences which he has described with generous enthusiasm, and I foresee some bad consequences which have escaped even his keen penetration. While the crown has many emoluments to bestow there will be many candidates, and among those candidates secret rivalry would be more dangerous, because more base, than a rivalry which is more open, and, therefore, restrained by some sense of shame. Speciously as placemen may betray, they receive their reward notoriously; and, therefore, the public eye is turned towards them with jealousy, nor will public indignation be wanting to hunt them down with infamy, when their apostacy from principle becomes flagitious. Though our senators were themselves thrust out of office, influence might yet exist, while they have uncles and nephews, while they have sons legitimate, and sons illegitimate, while they have flatterers and dependants. And who knows, but that, like a river forced out of its usual channel, and spreading itself through many smaller and more hidden streams, political corruption might gradually find its way to rapacious courtezans, to imperious matrons, and

> That store of ladies, whose bright eyes
> Rain influence, and judge the prize
> Of wit and arms——

At all events, the corruption which now circulates among the members of parliament would be diffused more widely among their constituents, and this surely would be to change a great evil for a greater. The senator is now a mixed character. He acts under a sense of different obligations, or, at least, from the impulse of different interests, all of which in their turn prevail. His attachment to the crown is in some measure controlled by responsibility to his constituents; and there are situations in which he is compelled to do homage to public opinion, in order to secure the power of gratifying his private avarice. But the constituent is not subject even to this imperfect control. Slight is the degree, and few are the occasions, upon which he feels responsibility to the country at large; and, if bound by personal interest to support the favourite measures of the crown, he will be disposed to elect such representatives as will secure to him the wages of his own corruption.

If the House of Lords be not included in the regulation proposed by Mr. Rous, it would seize, perhaps, a monopoly of public profits, it would be more and more disposed to support the claims of the crown against the rights of the people, and would grow at once in strength and in corruption. On the contrary, if it be included in that regulation, the effects, in a mixed government like our own, would be very formidable. The peers, being a fixed body,

would silently collect such a firm and compact mass of independence, as at some moment might weigh down the balance either against the crown or against the people. The House of Commons is, indeed, a fluctuating body; but, if its councils were in no degree influenced by the offices in the disposal of the crown, it would, in my opinion, sometimes rise too high, and sometimes sink too low, in the scale of national importance.

Great virtues are usually the offspring of great occasions. Upon the first establishment of a government, the sense of public duty may be a sufficient motive of action, and animate the honest ambition of those who mean well to their country. But, in the ordinary course of human affairs, motives of less purity, and less vigour, will have their share in guiding the deliberations of every legislative body; and, therefore, I call that form of government the best, which meets men as they really are, and which, controling by various means all their various principles, converts them ultimately into instruments of the public good.

Much has been said upon the excellence of our constitution, in the independence which it establishes among the component parts of our government; nor can it be denied, that in some degree they are, and in a great degree they ought to be, independent. But, in practice there is a real and an intimate connection between them, which produces its good as well as its bad effects: and a theory balancing those effects is, I believe, at present a desideratum in the politics of this country. Instead, therefore, of con-

lering them merely, or even chiefly, as mutual ecks, I have of late been accustomed to view :m as wheels facilitating the motion of each other a vast and complicated machine; and into this in of thinking I was led by some profound and iginal observations, which Mr. Fox has occasion-y dropped in parliament, and which shallow men ve been disposed to impute to the perverseness of position, or the wantonness of paradox. But, if r. Burke, in his projected treatise on the govern-:nt of England, should erect a firm and a stately ramid for the preservation of his own fame; from e summit of that goodly fabric we may hope to rvey, under one distinct and capacious prospect, ose splendid scenes, which hitherto have been :n only in broken and disorderly parts, and by a n and transient glimpse. In the mean time I am mpelled to allow with Mr. Hume (Essay 5.) that e interest of the legislative body (which by the ıy I in some respects distinguish from the interest the people) is restrained by the interest of indi-luals, and that the House of Commons stretches ıt its power, because such an usurpation would be ntrary to the interest of the majority of its mem-rs. "The crown," says he, "has so many offices its disposal, that, when assisted by the honest and ıinterested part of the House, it will always com-and the resolution of the whole, so far, at least, as preserve the ancient constitution from danger. 'e may, therefore, give to this influence what name : please. We may call it," and sometimes we may stly call it, "by the invidious appellation of corrup-

tion and dependence: but some degree, and some kind of it, are inseparable from the very nature of our constitution, and necessary to the preservation of our mixed government." The difficulty, no doubt, lies in adjusting that degree; and here I confess that "extraordinary efforts will be required to support our free government under those disadvantages," which Mr. Hume, (Essay 6.) seems to apprehend "from the immense property of which the crown disposes, from the increasing luxury of the nation, from our proneness to corruption, from the great power and prerogative of the crown, and from the command of such numerous military forces." To grapple with these difficulties successfully requires an equal portion of honesty and of talent, in the executive and the legislative parts of our government, an equal spirit of moderation to concede and of firmness to retain, an equal capacity for discerning what may be conceded without dishonour, and what may be retained without danger. But they who would remove every existing and every approaching evil by those simple and more popular forms of government which have lately been proposed, would do well to consider, that by grasping at too much they run the hazard of losing what may be attained without any violent convulsion* of the state. "Such is the nature of

* My dread is not from systems themselves, but from the want of wisdom and the want of moderation in those who would hastily and indiscriminately drag them into practice. In the dreadful moments of public convulsions, experiments even

novelty, says the philosopher abovementioned (Essay 6.) "that when any thing pleases, it becomes doubly agreeable, if new; and, if it displeases, it is doubly displeasing upon that account." Now, the tide of public opinion has of late years been turning fast towards monarchy,* and they who would force it back with excessive and sudden rapidity to the side of democracy, will, I fear, aggravate and perpetuate the mischiefs which they profess to avert.

---

of the most hazardous kind are sometimes unavoidable. But at present, such is the peaceable situation of our country, such are the comprehensive principles of our own constitution, and such the salutary prejudices, as well as the sterling good sense of our own countrymen, that we may justly look for those solid and permanent advantages which arise from the full maturity of moral causes, in the pursuit of which the zeal of reformation ought to be corrected by the calmness of philosophy.

* In stating this very interesting and very indisputable fact, I mean not to censure government, but to warn the governed.

"Subjects, as well as their princes, frequently imagine that freedom is a clog to the proceedings of government. They imagine, that despotical power is best fitted to procure dispatch, and secrecy in the execution of public councils to maintain what they are pleased to call political order, and to give a speedy redress of complaints. They even sometimes acknowledge, that if a succession of good princes could be found, despotical government is best calculated for the happiness of mankind. While they reason thus, they cannot blame a sovereign who, in the confidence that he is to employ his power for good purposes, endeavours to extend its limits, and in his own apprehension strives only to shake off the restraints which stand in the way of reason, and which prevent the effect of his friendly intentions."—Ferguson's Civil Society, Part 6th.

The metaphysical opinions which in this country floated upon the public mind during the war with America, eventually took a stronger hold upon the fears than upon the judgment of well-meaning and well-informed men, and disposed them to throw themselves back upon the protection of the established government with all its acknowledged faults, instead of chasing remote or ideal advantages, at the hazard of tumult, and with the certainty of innovation. They have reconciled us to the transfer of royal favour and public confidence, from the steady friends of the people to the haughty, and at the same time the insidious ministers of the Crown. They have effected the portentous exchange of jealousy in the cause of freedom for an indolent, and even a servile indifference to the silent, though progressive, increase of that power, from which Mr. Hume predicts the euthanasia of the British constitution — a power, of which "the discontinuous wounds," like those of some "ethereal substance," are quickly closed and quickly healed, and which, surviving alike the gradual decay, and the sudden extinction of opinions, of customs, of religions, and of laws, seems by the irrevocable decree of nature herself to be destined for immortality.

In respect to the project of Mr. Rous, I would be understood to disapprove, not of the principle itself, but of the extent in which he would apply it; and the present condition of France confirms me in that disapprobation. By an undistinguishing and intemperate eagerness for the attainment of that perfection, which metaphysical writers have holden

up to the admiration of a lively and gallant people, the government of France has been stripped of many solid supports, and decorated with some ornaments, which to me appear cumbersome and fantastic. When the intestine and external dangers which threaten France shall be happily removed, I flatter myself, that the government will gradually retire from those extremities to which it has been pushed by the ardour of experiment, by the violence of the prevailing party, by the necessity of spreading before the people the allurements of novelty, and by the yet stronger necessity of leaving no power in the hands of those who were bigotted in their attachment to the old and established principles of monarchy. But the jealousy now subsisting between the members of the National Assembly and the ministers of the Crown, the embarrassments which those ministers must ever meet in conducting the business of an extensive empire, under the restraints of an immediate and most irksome responsibility; the tried, and, it should seem, the acknowledged impropriety of public discussion upon many subjects of political detail; the necessity of referring those subjects to committees, which, after the fervour of novelty has cooled, will always be exposed to secret management and indirect corruption; the difficulty of obtaining official information, and the yet greater difficulty of enforcing speedy, vigorous, and faithful execution—all these circumstances conspire in convincing me, that the attempt has been made in France without success, and that the theory of a total separation between the legisla-

tive and the executive bodies is false; because it is either incapable of being reduced to real practice, or, if practised, is injurious to good government. As to researches into the truth of that theory, merely ex hypothesi, I should read with pleasure the arguments by which ingenious men might support it, if they would fairly warn their readers that they are writing like Plato in his Republic, or like More in his Utopia. In the investigation of physical causes we depend much upon accident; the process of experiments themselves is slow, and the general conclusions to which they lead long remain doubtful. But the force of moral causes lies more nearly within our reach, and there can be little hope of moral improvement unless that force in all its various directions, and all its intricate combinations, be calculated again and again, and presented to the views of those who can bring it into action. Unhappily the greater part of such men as govern the affairs of the world are seldom trained to habits of investigation; and for this reason it is, that I maintain the necessity of high intellectual attainments in those who are to execute, as well as in those who are to control the councils of nations. For, amidst the fluctuating tempers and the varying interests of large communities, greater or less opportunities for practical application will arise, when the most accomplished statesman will find himself enlightened by consulting the storehouse of abstract speculation. Conducted as theory sometimes is, by men of ability and virtue, by a Locke, a Sydney, and even a Harrington, it is of general use, because

ncidently throws some portion of light upon the
l conduct of men, and the real interests of states.
as I grant that Mr. Rous has unfolded a most
ıtary principle, and sure I am that he will not be
nded with me for endeavouring to give it a more
: and permanent effect, by salutary restrictions.
low, whether my opinion about the governments
France and England be well or ill-founded, I
ainly had no concern with those meetings for
ımemoration, which have been the objects of so
:h acrimonious invective, and the source, in my
;hbourhood, of so many shocking depredations.
d not believe them to be illegal, but I thought
n indiscreet; and, therefore, without the smallest
ıtation, and in the strongest terms, I more than
lined two indirect sorts of invitation which had
ı sent to me from two different quarters. It is
for me either to justify or to condemn other
ı who acted from other motives. But, for my
t, I was unwilling by any public overt-act to en-
rage rash and inconsiderate persons in confound-
the events in France with the condition of Eng-
l. I disdained to debase my character as a citi-
and as a clergyman by the slightest appearance
indecorum. I shrunk from the thought of irri-
ng * those passions, which it is my duty alike to

Upon the same principles of moderation I have acted with
e effect since the riots. A very zealous and well-meaning
:chman lately put into my hands a political dialogue, which
been published at Birmingham, and was to be followed by
:r dialogues of the same kind. After reading it, I told

assuage by precept and by example. While, however, I accede to the observation of Mr. Hume, that in the conflict of public opinions the most moderate * are generally the most wise, I know, by my own melancholy experience, that they are not always the most safe.

When "pity," as Antony says, "is choked with custom of foul deeds," in vain would an honest man plead, "I am not Cinna the conspirator." "It is

---

this gentleman that I highly disapproved of its contents, and that, at this crisis especially, I was very much afraid of its consequences. At the same time I took an opportunity of communicating, by letter, the same opinion to a gentleman of great political moderation, who is acquainted with some persons in the opposite party, and I desired him to employ his advice, and the whole authority of his character, in checking, if he could, a publication of which I knew it was impossible for him to approve. He complied with my request, and I hear that no more dialogues have since appeared. I probably should not have seen the book if my friend, the loyalist, had not shewn it to me. I have not heard the name of the author, and, indeed, I have no desire to know it. Be his abilities what they may, I must condemn him for employing them in such a manner at such a time.

* I know persons who, having neither taste to feel, nor judgment to distinguish, the beauties of Mr. Burke's book, affect to be called his disciples, and have also verified one of Mr. Burke's very important observations. "If any [person] should happen to propose a scheme of liberty soberly limited, and defined with proper qualification, * * * suspicion will be raised of his fidelity to his cause, moderation will be stigmatized as the virtue of cowards, and compromise as the prudence of traitors." Such is the language of certain wretches in this country about those who differ from them.

o matter," would the bigot and the rioter exclaim, His name is Cinna, tear him, tear him; come, rands, ho! fire-brands."

Though I do not think myself bound to tilt with ery doughty champion who may summon me into e lists of controversy for the choice of my private ends; yet I am not without some local and ighty reasons for blunting by anticipation the ge of those mischievous weapons which malevo- ice is ever ready to forge, and prejudice to wield. Be it known then to all whom it may concern, at my personal acquaintance with Dr. Priestley l not commence till the spring of 1790. Some ars before I had spoken to Dr. Priestley, I had casion, in one of my publications,* to censure m; and when he had replied with equal firmness d equal politeness, I was so graceless as neither despise nor to hate him.

In October 1789, when I preached for the cha- y-schools at Birmingham, I earnestly recom- ended to the audience two admirable sermons ich Dr. Priestley had written upon a topic very nilar to my own. In the course of my observa- ns I in one place glanced at the "marked pecu- rities of Dr. Priestley upon controversial topics," d in another I stated confidently what I shall w state again, that the views of the writer "are -extensive with the magnitude and dignity of his

* In a note upon my last sermon preached for the charity- ools at Norwich.

subject, and, therefore, they are not fettered by any limitation from particular modes of theological doctrine, or particular forms of ecclesiastical discipline." Thus much I said to inform the congregation that the perusal of Dr. Priestley's sermons would not be attended with any danger to their faith; and I did not say more, because neither the time nor the place required theological disputation.

Early in 1790 I resisted Dr. Priestley and his friends in their endeavours to procure the repeal of the Test Act; and on this occasion I had the pleasure of acting with two or three worthy laymen of Birmingham, and with one clergyman for whom I have a great esteem.

About a month or two after, Dr. Priestley and I met; and here begins a black catalogue of crimes, which have been long enveloped in darkness, but which I am now audacious enough to plant before legions of senseless and merciless calumniators in open day.

I knew that Dr. John Leland of Ireland lived upon terms of intimacy with many English prelates —that Archbishop Secker preserved his acquaintance with Dr. Samuel Chandler—that Dr. Johnson admitted the visits of Dr. Fordyce, and did not decline the company of Dr. Mayo. When I myself too lived at Norwich, Mr. Bourne, a dissenting teacher, not less eminent for the boldness of his opinions than for the depth of his researches, was very well received by the worthiest and most respectable clergymen of that city. I was therefore, and now

an, at a loss to see why a clergyman of the Church of England should shun the presence of a dissenting minister, merely because they do not agree upon doctrinal points which have long divided the Christian world; and indeed I have always found, that when men of sense and virtue mingle in free conversation, the harsh and confused suspicions which they may have entertained of each other gradually give way to more just and more candid sentiments.

In reality, the example of many great and good men averts every imputation of impropriety from such intercourse, and the information which I have myself occasionally gained by conversing with learned teachers of many different sects, will always make me remember with satisfaction, and acknowledge with thankfulness, the favour which they have done to me by their unreserved and judicious communications.

Not having heard Dr. Priestley in the pulpit,* and knowing that in the city of Dublin Churchmen, Dissenters, and Catholics lay aside all distinctions to attend sermons for charity-schools, I, in the summer of 1790, was once present, when Dr. Priestley delivered a sermon of this kind at Warwick. Not

* This, I believe, is no uncommon practice with the clergy. When Dr. Foster preached in the Old Jewry, it was no disgrace for ecclesiastics to go and hear him, however they might differ from him upon abstruse points of speculation. Men of talents are not entirely free from the passion of curiosity.

having seen the ceremony of ordination among the dissenters, I was a spectator of one, where Dr. Priestley assisted, Once I have been guilty of drinking tea, and once of dining with him at Warwick. Once I permitted him, forsooth, to dine with me at Hatton. Once I was so hardy as to accompany my friend Mr. Porson for the purpose of meeting the very learned Mr. Berington * at Dr. Priestley's house; and when four such men as Dr. Priestley, Mr. Berington, Mr. Porson, and myself, ate together,† drank together, and chatted together

* This excellent writer and most respectable man had been engaged in a controversy of some importance with Dr. Priestley, before they were acquainted. In truth, men of improved understandings and rooted virtue do not suffer difference of opinion to give them unfavourable impressions of each other. Let us hear what Johnson himself said, when, unruffled by contradiction, and looking to truth, not to victory, he thus conversed with his inquisitive and candid Tory friend. He repeated his observation, that "the differences among Christians are really of no consequence: for instance (said he), if a Protestant objects to a Papist, 'You worship images,'" the Papist can answer, "I do not insist on your doing it; you may be a very good Papist without it; I do it only as a help to my devotion." I said the great article of Christianity is the revelation of immortality. Johnson admitted it was.—Vol. ii. p. 166, Boswell.

Upon the importance of the doctrine which Johnson admitted, there is a passage in Archdeacon Paley's Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy, which for comprehension of remark, solidity of thought, and solemn grandeur of diction, I consider as one of the noblest instances of composition in the English language. The reader will find it in page 109, vol. ii. 6th edition in octavo.

† I hope to give no very unfavourable opinion of our con-

at such a place as Fair Hill, and in such a month as November, real incendiaries may, for aught I know, be taught to suppose that some attempts were made towards a second gunpowder plot. Unfortunately, however, for our design, neither Mr. Porson, I believe, nor myself, have seen our other two associates from that time * to the present.

Besides paying and receiving all these visits, I have condescended to accept from Dr. Priestley some of his controversial publications; I have dared to write to him three or four letters, and vouchsafed to receive from him four or five; nay, I have carried my complaisance so far as to examine with great accuracy, and with little or no change of my original and orthodox opinion, the dispute in which

---

versation when I add, that a fifth person in company was one of the peaceable and loyal people called quakers; I forget his name, but he seemed to be a person of sound judgment and extensive information; and I believe that he is no less an enemy than myself to the modern doctrine of deposing monarchs, and the modern practice of burning conventicles.

* This statement was exact when I wrote it; but at the beginning of February I had the pleasure of dining with Mr. Dilly in the Poultry, and of meeting at his house Dr. Priestley, Mr. Isaac Reed, Mr. Cumberland, Mr. Belsham, Mr. Hoole, Mr. Braithwaite, Dr. Thompson of Kensington, Mr. Sharpe, and two or three learned members of the University of Cambridge. Hard is my fate, to be thus under the necessity of quelling slander by the detail of what passes in private life. Bigots will be surprised to hear, that the very day after I had seen Dr. Priestley I spent a most agreeable afternoon with the ingenious and worthy Mr. Jones, author of a celebrated work in defence of the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity.

this Heresiarch was engaged with an illustrious prelate. Upon one topic,* where my fixed belief is diametrically opposite to that of Dr. Priestley, I confessed myself dissatisfied with some arguments used by his antagonist. Upon other topics I condemned the austerity of that antagonist's spirit, though I have always given him just and ample credit for mathematical knowledge, for classical erudition, for acuteness of reasoning, and for splendour of diction.

Lately I had the honour of being consulted by Dr. Priestley upon a subject of some importance, and I gave, at his request, my unreserved advice, for which, if I were at liberty to proclaim it, I should have the approbation of all serious churchmen, all impartial sectaries, and all sober-minded citizens.

Such, and such only, has been my connection with Dr. Priestley. And was it for this that, in a season of deep distress and dreadful danger, my principles were on a sudden gnawed at by vermin whispers, and worried by brutal reproaches? that my house was marked out for conflagration? that my family were for three days and three nights agitated with consternation and dismay? that my books, which I have long been collecting with indefatigable industry — upon which I have expended more than half the produce of more than twenty years unwea-

* I mean the spiritual evidence for the miraculous conception.

ried labour—and which I considered as the pride of my youth, the employment of my riper age, and, perhaps, the best solace of declining life—was it for this, I say, that my very books were exposed to most unexpected, most unmerited destruction? In what age, or in what country, do I live? Whither, as an unoffending citizen, shall I flee for the protection of the laws; and where, as a diligent and a faithful teacher of Christianity, where shall I look for its salutary influence, even among those who make their boast of being its most zealous defenders? O superbiam inauditam! Alios in facinore gloriari, aliis ne dolere quidem impunitè licere.* But the ways of Providence are unsearchable; and among all the anomalies which baffle conjecture, and afflict sensibility, in the moral world, the follies, the ficklenesses, and the passions of man, are the most inexplicable and the most deplorable. He is a tyrant in defence of liberty—he is a plunderer for the support of law. He is an oppressor for the honour of government. He is a savage in the very bosom of society. He becomes the unrelenting persecutor of his species for the imaginary glory of his God.

My heart throbs so feelingly, and my conscience is so entirely unclouded by guilt or fear, that I cannot yet retire from those subjects, from which some men will boldly draw those invidious inferences, which others with a sort of instinctive subtilty have

* Vid. Epist. Famil. Cic. lib. ii. epist. xxv.

been content to lodge in the dark ambuscade of insinuation.

In the name of common sense, then, and of common humanity, let me ask, can the unlettered, and therefore the prejudiced classes of mankind, be privileged to prescribe the bounds of social intercourse to enlightened men, who, from the very circumstance of being enlightened, are most qualified to assist others in emerging from the gloom of ignorance, and in shaking off the fetters of every unsocial and unchristian antipathy? Did not Dr. Johnson himself endure, and, as I am told, almost solicit an interview with Dr. Priestley, whose tenets he openly reprobated, and whose sect he derided, too coarsely, as I think, and too indiscriminately? Instead of shunning contagion from the presence of a polemic, who had "blown with a louder blast than his fellows the horn of battle," did not Professor White * converse with him easily and

* The learned Professor (to his honour be it spoken) was, on this occasion, and, I believe, habitually is, actuated by the same good spirit by which the orthodox bishops were distinguished after their return from banishment, into which they had been driven by Valens. Their conduct was so exemplary in all respects towards the Arian bishops, that I cannot refuse my readers the satisfaction of perusing the following passage:

Προεδρίας οὐδὲν ἐφόντισαν· ἀλλὰ τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῶν λαῶν προτιμήσαντες, μὴ καταλιπεῖν σφᾶς ἐδεήθησαν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρείου αἱρέσεως, μήδε διχονοίᾳ κατατέμνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἣν παρὰ Θεοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλων μίαν παραδοθεῖσαν, φιλονεικίαι καὶ φιλοπροεδρίαι εἰς πολλὰς κατεμέρισαν.—Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 2.

But the behaviour of Eulalius, bishop of Amasia, towards an

amicably when they met at the great Armoury of Heresy in St. Paul's Church-yard? Did not the Dean of Christ Church, with his usual sagacity and good humour, call Dr. Priestley "a Trinitarian in politics, and an Unitarian in religion," when they saw each other at Oxford? Did not Mr. Burke himself visit Dr. Priestley at Birmingham? Yes. These great and worthy men did not think it inconsistent with the purity of their faith, or the dignity of their stations, to interchange the courtesies of gentlemen and of scholars with Dr. Priestley. But no busy tongue has dared to blacken them for these actions in the opinion of mankind. No accusing angel has been permitted to record them as subjects of condemnation in the awful registry of Heaven.

Living, as I have done, for the space of more than five years within the distance of sixteen miles from Dr. Priestley, I have seen him far less often than one man of letters would wish to see another under the same circumstances.

I never had the slightest communication with Dr. Priestley upon matters of government, either

---

Arian bishop, who lived in the same city, was so amiable, and so uncommon, that I will venture to lengthen this note by a second quotation from the same chapter of Sozomen:

Προνοούμενος ὁ Εὐλάλιος τῆς παντῶν ἑνώσεως, ἀντεβόλησεν αὐτὸν πρωτεύειν, καὶ κοινῇ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰθύνειν, ἄθλον ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ τὴν προεδρίαν ἔχοντα.

The Arian bishop churlishly refused this honcurable offer, and Eulalius by his moderation won over the Arians of his diocese to the orthodox faith.

speculative or practical, and in all probability I never shall. Yet I have visited him, as I hope to visit him again, because he is an unaffected, unassuming, and very instructive companion. I will not, in consequence of our different opinions, either impute to him the evil which he does not, or depreciate in him the good which he is allowed to do. I will not debase my understanding, nor prostitute my honour, by encouraging the clamours* which have been raised against him in vulgar minds, by certain persons who would have done well to read before they wrote — to under-

* Upon this grave subject let me quote the words of a learned Bishop: "Evil speaking and slander, lying and falsehood, can never enter into the character of that man who professes to be a follower of the blessed Jesus. And I may add, that, however common it be in the world, yet we ought always to avoid, as a most mischievous vice, all fierceness and uncharitableness in the carrying on of our civil and religious disputes. Too much of this is to be seen almost every where; for the furious and the passionate of all parties have so far conquered all humanity within them, that they can wound, and, as it were, stab to the heart, the character of any man whom they dislike, not only without remorse, but even with pleasure."—Bishop Pearce.

This prelate probably would not have agreed with Dr. Johnson, when he said, that where a man voluntarily engages in an important controversy, he is to do all he can to lessen his antagonist, because authority from personal respect has much weight with most people, and often more than reasoning.—Vol. ii. page 24. Boswell.

What Johnson said to Mr. Murray (see page 49) is less unreasonable. And, indeed, when infidels or heretics play the part of scoffers and sophists, they who defend the truth must feel indignation, and have a right to express it.

stand, before they dogmatized — to examine, before they condemned. Readily do I give him up, as the bold defender of heresy and schism, to the well-founded objections of his antagonists: but I cannot think his religion insincere, while he worships one Deity in the name of one Saviour; nor do I suppose that his acts of justice, temperance, and charity, have the "nature of sin," because they sometimes flow more immediately from reason, as absurdly contradistinguished in scholastic language from faith. I will not compare his opinions with the opinions of Mr. Gibbon, because Mr. Gibbon casts aside the evidence of all miracles whatsoever, and because he derides revelation, as well as rejects it—I will not degrade his morals to a level with the morals of Mr. Hume, who in his more popular writings has taught the inconsiderate, the ignorant, and the innocent, to think with diminished horror, not of adultery only, but of other impurities too flagitious to be named. When I find a writer bearing among philosophical men in his own country the name of a philosopher, and honoured by the testimony of many foreign universities, I must look up to him as something higher than a "mere lucky experimentalist"—I must respect him as something better than a mere decorous "atheist,"* when I know that his virtues in private life are acknow-

* With odious atheist names they load their foes,
And never fail in charities, like those.
In climes where true religion is profess'd,
That imputation were no laughing jest. DRYDEN.

ledged by his neighbours, admired by his congregation, and recorded almost by the unanimous suffrage of his most powerful and most distinguished antagonists. Upon every subject of literature which comes within my reach, I will talk and I will write to him without reserve, and in proportion as his opinions may appear to me to approach truth, or to recede from it, I shall assent without reluctance, or dissent without dissimulation. The same would be my conduct towards the orthodox Bishop Horne,* and towards the renowned champion of

* Soon after my papers were sent to the press, this prelate paid the great debt of nature; and of such a prelate as Dr. George Horne, who would not be eager to record, that the life which had been spent in virtue and in holiness, was closed in calm and pious resignation? Little as I am disposed to embrace either some philosophical opinions which he was known to entertain, or some proofs of scriptural doctrine which he was accustomed to enforce, I cannot forbear to praise Dr. Horne at that moment, when to flatter him were vain. To me his character was known only by his writings and by report. But they who were acquainted with him personally, concur with me in giving him credit for uniting a playful fancy with a serious heart. He is, indeed, distinguished as an antagonist of the Unitarians, and as an advocate for the Hutchinsonians. But his temper was never contaminated by the virulence of bigotry, and his taste diffused a colouring of elegance over the wild, but not unlovely, visions of enthusiasm. His peculiarities did not obscure his excellencies. He loved Hebrew, and he understood Greek. He defended Hutchinson; but in spirit and in truth "he had learned Christ." His known sincerity gave a fuller and a wider effect to his celebrated piety: Dr. Horne professed only what he believed; he practised what he taught. Having really been "a saint in crape," he did not affect the appearance of being "twice a saint in lawn." May the Church

orthodoxy, Bishop Horsley, if I could rank these respectable prelates among my correspondents. The same has been my conduct to that most amiable man, and most accomplished scholar, Dr. Bennet, the Bishop of Cork, to the profound and sagacious Dr. Nathaniel Forster,* to the learned Mr. Burgess, to the celebrated Dr. White, whom I have yet the pleasure to call my friend, and to Dr. Martin Routh, president of Magdalen college, Oxford —let me pause at the mention of this venerable name. Why should I deny myself the satisfaction I must feel in saying of him here, what of such a man I should say every where, with equal justice and with equal triumph? The friendship of this excellent person, believe me, readers, will ever be ranked by me among the sweetest consolations and the proudest ornaments of my life—he, in the language of Milton,† "is the virtuous son of a virtuous father," whose literary attainments are respected by every scholar to whom he is known, whose exemplary virtues shed a lustre on that church in which they have not been rewarded, and whose grey hairs will never descend to the grave, but amidst the blessings of the devout and the tears of the poor. He fills a station for which other men are sometimes indebted to the cabals of parties or to the caprices of fortune, but in which he was

---

of England ever be adorned by such prelates, such scholars, and such men, as a Watson, a Bagot, and a Horne!

* Late of Colchester.

† See the Sonnet to Mr. Lawrence.

himself most honourably placed from the experience his electors had long had of his integrity, and the confidence they reposed in his discernment, in his activity, and in his impartiality. The attachment he professes to academical institutions proceeds not less from a sincere conviction of their utility, than from a deep reverence for the wisdom of antiquity in the regulations it has made for preserving the morals of youth, and for promoting the cultivation of learning. His government over the affairs of a great and respectable college is active without officiousness, and firm without severity. His independence of spirit is the effect, not of ferocious pride, but of a cool and steady principle, which claims only the respect it is ever ready to pay, and which equally disdains to trample upon subordination, and to crouch before the insolence of power. His correct judgment, his profound erudition,* and his various knowledge, are such as

* The fame of Dr. Routh as a scholar does not rest upon the partial suffrages of private friends, upon the dogmatical decisions of literary cabals, or upon those pompous decisions which are introduced into academical societies with little difficulty, supported by little proof, and then being echoed and re-echoed without intermission and without enquiry, roll down from one short-lived generation to another as incontrovertible truths. My friend has made a public appeal to the learned world in his edition of the Georgias and Euthydemus of Plato, which was published in 1784. The notes are more full than those of Etwal upon some other dialogues of Plato, and more learned than those of the celebrated Forster. With an exception to the praise of conjectural emendation, Dr. Routh's work deserves to be classed with Musgrave's Euripides and

seldom fall to the lot of man. His liberality* is scarcely surpassed even by his orthodoxy, and his orthodoxy is not the tumid and fungous excrescence of prejudice, but the sound and mellowed fruit of honest and indefatigable enquiry. In a word, his mind, his whole mind, is decked at once

---

Toup's Longinus. I have sometimes wished that the editor had added, like Forster, an Index Atticus; and I am happy to inform scholars, that in an old copy of Olympiodorus he has inserted various additions and corrections from that MS. copy which lately disappeared from the rooms of a very learned and very excellent man, to whom it had been lent by Dr. Routh.

* I can apply to my friend what Johnson says of Zachary Mudge: "By a solicitous examination of objections, and judicious comparison of opposite arguments, he attained, what enquiry never gives but to industry and perspicuity, a firm and unshaken settlement of conviction. But his firmness was without asperity; for, knowing with how much difficulty truth was sometimes found, he did not wonder that many missed it." —Boswell's Life of Johnson, vol. ii. p. 375. The truth of the concluding sentence will be felt by every man of deep reflection; and well does it become those who are not in the habit of reflecting deeply, to weigh its moral and religious importance in mitigating their prejudices, and in restraining their invectives, upon certain difficult and momentous subjects. Glad should I be if this opinion of Johnson's were, in Johnson's words, written like the motto of Capaneus, "in golden letters," and hung up, not only in every dissenting academy, but in every hall of every college in those two noble seminaries, which, as Milton says of Athens, I revere as "the eyes" of this kingdom. See upon this subject some excellent remarks in pages 3 and 4 of Newte's Tour through England and Scotland—a work which I think replete with profound research and useful observations, which do equal honour to the author as a philosopher and a patriot.

with the purest crystals of simplicity, and the brightest jewels of benevolence and piety.

> "His life is gentle, and the elements
> So mix'd in him, that Nature may stand up
> And say to all the world, this is a man."

The reader, if he be a man of letters, and a man of virtue, would perhaps wish me to pursue this digression yet farther; and, at all events, he will excuse me for detaining him from a dry detail of petty facts, to contemplate for a while so noble a character as that of Dr. Martin Routh.

Dr. Priestley, I was well aware, differed from many clergymen in the establishment, and from myself too, upon many topics of controversial divinity, and of abstract politics. He had lately, I was told, incurred the displeasure even of candid churchmen, by his Familiar Letters to the Inhabitants of Birmingham, and by his answer to Mr. Burke's well known and much admired pamphlet. He was connected by habits of intimacy, and perhaps by similarity of opinion, with several gentlemen who assembled at the Revolution dinner. He had suffered equally with some other dissenters,* by the depredations committed upon his property; and more than the rest, by the destruction of his philosophi-

* Little as I am inclined to commend the prejudices and peculiarities of the dissenters, I will always do open and ample justice to their moral characters. Let me observe, then, that of the persons who suffered in the late riots, two or three are men of exemplary lives, and the rest are quite irreproachable. This circumstance deserves serious consideration from all good men, of all religions, and all political parties.

cal apparatus, by the dispersion of his various papers, by the attacks let loose upon his character, and by the outrages meditated against his person. In addition to these severities, he, by the loss of those papers, was at such a crisis exposed to invisible and irresistible evils, from invisible and innumerable quarters. He might suffer from private malignity what public justice could not inflict. The ruffian, the gossip, and the informer, had invaded that asylum which the laws had made sacred from the intrusions even of the magistrate. Knowing, therefore, as I do, the confidential intercourse that subsists between men of letters, I foresaw that he might be loaded with responsibility for unpopular or novel tenets, which his friends had communicated to him, and to which he might not himself, in every instance, or to every degree of extent, accede.

I know that the Birmingham riots were distinguished from the London riots by many singular and many hideous circumstances; by a seeming regularity of contrivance—by a "strange chaos of levity and ferocity" in the execution—by reports of debility,* reluctance, and outrageous partiality in

* Whether these reports be well or ill founded it is not for me to determine. But sure I am that no blame can be laid on the venerable judges who presided at Worcester and at Warwick. And I am happy to say, that the gentlemen of the grand jury in this country deserve the thanks of the community for their upright and impartial conduct. Remembering the escape of other, but, perhaps, not better men, I rejoice most sincerely at the pardon of the two criminals condemned

the administration of public justice—by the temporary extinction of common prudence, common justice, and common humanity in private companies—

---

at Warwick, though I confess that the enquiry made into the case of one of them after his condemnation was a very unusual and a very ungracious measure. As to the unhappy wretches who suffered, I lament that their execution at a place so distant from the scene of their crimes tended to weaken the salutary and awful effects of public justice; and I am sorry to add, that their general depravity of conduct being assigned as a reason for their exclusion from the royal mercy, has drawn off the attention of the common people from their guilt in the riots to their other and lighter offences. The king doubtless has upon this occasion done his duty, as he had wisely done it before in London, where several persons, not as partizans but as magistrates, not as joining in the vulgar cry but as neglecting to quell it, not as abetting the riots but as afraid of the rioters, were notoriously deserters of the public cause. But the Warwickshire business, after all, is dark, very dark, and calls for a strict investigation in Parliament. I should do great injustice to Lord Aylesford, and four or five country gentlemen who interposed during our riots, if I did not add, that they are entitled to the thanks of their neighbours and the praise of their country, for their courage and for their humanity. I cannot, however, dissemble the concern I felt at some injudicious expressions, which, from the dreadful confusion of the moment, were admitted into one of the addresses signed by their very respectable names. But this oversight will be forgotten or forgiven, when the purity of their motives, and the activity of their exertions, shall be remembered to their honour. What I have said of Lord Aylesford, and the country gentlemen who acted with him, is said sincerely and justly. But addresses to mobs are subject to the same inconveniences with remonstrances to king and petitions to parliament. In all of them may be found signatures of the Megarensian sort, which, therefore, among men of sense, are *οὐδ' ἐν λόγῳ, οὐδ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ*.

by the most shameless language of triumph in some diurnal and monthly publications,* which have a wide, and in this case, I fear, a baleful effect upon national opinion—and by vestiges of such remorseless and ill-disguised approbation in certain well-educated men,† here and elsewhere, as in times past would have steeled the heart for participation in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in the fires of Smithfield, and in those human sacrifices which the Christian world has often seen exhibited as acts of faith by the holy order of St. Dominic. Pudet hæc opprobria, &c. All these symptoms of decay in

* In the ministerial papers there were inflammatory predictions of tumults long before the riots, and after them was assumed a yet more audacious language of approbation. It is easy to account for such writers, however reproachful it may be to a Christian country, that they found employers and readers. But that a magazine, of which I know the conductor to be a man of sense and honour, should admit any justification of the offenders, or any triumph over the sufferers, is indeed surprising. "Let Paine, let Priestley, let all the Unitarians, and all the Revolutionists, be condemned for their opinions, but for Heaven's sake, Mr. Urban, let no man ever be warranted in bringing either of these two charges against the Gentleman's Magazine, that it puts a firebrand into the hands of a mob, and calls upon them to execute justice, or that it encourages the doing of a great and positive evil to prevent an uncertain one."—Gentleman's Magazine, Nov. 1791, p. 1007.

† Far be it from me even to insinuate that this was generally the case. All the better, and much the greater part of that class of men to whom I allude, would, I am sure, "have disavowed with horror those wretches, who claimed a fellowship with them upon no other titles than those of having pillaged persons with whom they maintained controversies."—P. 222, of Burke's Reflections.

the spirit of social union, and of Christian charity, I knew, I lamented, and upon proper occasions I have most pointedly condemned, sometimes by remonstrance in conversation, and sometimes by instruction from the pulpit.*—But in respect to Dr. Priestley, whatever may be his demerits, and whatever may have been his sufferings, I really thought that after his flight he had nothing farther to apprehend from those enemies who were actuated by the feelings of gentlemen, or by the principles of Christians. As the fury of the storm had subsided a little, and as the mischief had exceeded the probable expectations, and even the professed wishes, of those who called themselves the advocates for church and king, I flattered myself that public zeal would be tempered by some portion of private virtue, and that compassion itself, if not respect, would by degrees pave the way to justice. Whether I considered Dr. Priestley as a celebrated man, or as an injured man, or as a suspected man, I distinguished between the deliberate measures of an in-

* I have great satisfaction in saying, that the sentiments of my parishioners, though very friendly, as I trust they always will be, to the interests and the honour of our ecclesiastical and civil establishments, were, in one or two instances only, marked by that sanguinary spirit of violence which had pervaded other parts of the country. I am bound also to add, that the strenuous and kind assistance which many of them gave my family in the hour of danger, will ever endear them to their minister, and entitles them to commendation from all well wishers to the church and state, in whom zeal is united with knowledge, and knowledge has been productive of charity and vital religion.

dividual, and the impetuous passions of the multitude;* and, with this distinction before me, I should have pronounced that every letter of Dr. Priestley's found in every place would have been received for him without hesitation, preserved for him without inspection, or transmitted to him without delay, by every honest man of every political and every religious party. Nay, in the confined circle of my own acquaintance at Birmingham, I could have pointed out several warm but worthy churchmen, who would have spurned the idea of reading letters which they had no right to open, of suspecting letters which they had no right to read, and of forwarding letters which, without opening and reading them, they probably could have little right or little temptation to suspect; for Dr. Priestley's correspondence, it is well known, extends to the orthodox and to the heterodox, to loyalists and to republicans, to scholars of every class, and to citizens of almost every country.

---

* To reflecting minds, the riots at Birmingham will not be altogether without use. They prove the existence and the violence of that odious spirit which many good men were disposed to think extinct, and which it is the duty of all good governors to watch, to discourage, and to control. I will hazard the imputation of quaintness, in applying to these disturbances what Ovid himself has quaintly said of the conflagration occasioned by Phaeton:

—— "Incendia lucem
Præbebant, aliquisque malo fuit usus in illo."

The following passage occurs in the Preface:

The attention of the public is a most gracious boon, which they who solicit it should also be ready to deserve, by the judicious choice and the skilful management of their subject, by liveliness of imagery or solidity of reasoning, by descriptions that may captivate, or by disquisitions that may improve. But nothing can be more irksome to an ingenuous mind, than to call the notice of a reader to a topic merely personal, and by which, therefore, few will be amused, and none, probably, can be instructed. With a narrative, indeed, of such causes as produce, and of such circumstances as inflame, the quarrels of private men, it is not easy to interweave any truths of high and extensive usefulness; and as to the advantage to be derived from those moral reflections which may be excited by the conduct of the parties, it is too often impeded by personal dislike and personal predilection, by doubts upon facts, which they who entertain them think it not worth while to settle, and by opinions of character which it is scarcely possible to alter.

The historian commands attention, and rewards it, by selecting the more brilliant circumstances of great events, by unfolding the characteristic qualities of eminent personages, and by tracing well-known effects through all the obliquities and all the recesses of their secret causes. From the ordinary occurrences of life, as they influence the conduct of extraordinary men, the biographer collects such

scattered rays as may be concentrated into one bright assemblage of truth upon the character which he has undertaken to delineate. Even the novelist throws his enchantments around the fancy by fictitious representations, which he can at will embellish into beauty or exalt into dignity; and the polemic exercises his dominion over the reasoning faculties, by poignancy of remark and by subtilty of confutation. But none of these advantages fall to the lot of him who engages in such a narrative as I am compelled to pursue. He ascends no eminence, he reposes under no shade, but is continually toiling onward without the cheering consciousness of progression, sometimes oppressed with languor, amidst the dulness and the sameness of the scenes which surround him, and sometimes roused into exertion by the noxious weeds that may offend his senses, or by the rude briars that would intercept his way.

Upon such occasions as this, the stoutest advocate in the best cause seldom has it in his power to produce in the minds of others those emotions, which he may himself most keenly and most sincerely feel. Though proofs be accumulated, though arguments be framed, though eloquence be displayed to break the uniformity of narrative, and though wit be called in to temper the severity of reason, the exertion of all these various powers will be silently counteracted and finally defeated, by the want of bulkiness, or the want of splendour, in the subject itself. Conscious of little real sympathy, and expecting no useful instruction, men begin to

read with vague inquisitiveness, they continue to read with growing indifference, and at last, with secret satisfaction, they cease to read. The candid are not pleased, the prejudiced are not convinced, the indolent are wearied, and the impertinent or the malevolent alone are gratified. Even the members of those petty cabals, which are sometimes formed in consequence of petty disputes among their acquaintance, cannot long retain their importance or their ardour. When they tell the tale which has often been told before, and tell it with fresh vehemence, unaccompanied by fresh evidence, they soon find themselves unable to allure a hearer, or to provoke an opponent. Parties of this kind start up like a bubble, suddenly and noisily, and like a bubble too, they dissolve and pass away, without notice and without effect.

By that countless and harmless swarm of scribblers who amuse themselves, and readers equally idle with themselves, by paragraphs upon my opinions in politics, my peculiarities in dress, or my love of antient literature, I have too much firmness, and indeed too much understanding, to be offended for one moment. My character, I am told, presents a wide front of attack to these puny assailants, and so long as they abstained from the poisoned weapons of malevolence, I often smiled, as no doubt I often shall smile again at the light and feeble shafts of ridicule. But when a person shews a fixed determination to inflict, if he can, some deep

deadly wound upon my moral feelings, I will refrain from doing that justice which I alike to him and to myself. The regard which I generally, and justly paid to literary reputa-, must, in this one instance give way to the e I entertain of personal honour. "Omnino abiliora sunt quæ lacessiti dicimus quàm quæ res."—Vide Cicero de Orat. lib. ii.

A

LETTER

FROM IRENOPOLIS

TO THE

NHABITANTS OF ELEUTHEROPOLIS;

OR,

A SERIOUS ADDRESS

TO

THE DISSENTERS OF BIRMINGHAM.

LETTER

TO THE

DISSENTERS OF BIRMINGHAM.

Multa in homine, Demea,
Signa insunt, ex quibu' conjectura facile fit,
Duo cum idem faciunt, sæpe ut possis dicere,
Hoc licet impune facere huic, illi non licet:
Non quo dissimilis res sit, sed quo is qui facit.

TERENCE, ADELPHI—*Act v. Scene 4.*

GENTLEMEN,

PERMIT me to address you in a spirit of candour and respect, and under the sacred and endearing names of fellow-citizens and fellow-christians. With intentions not less pure, and, probably, after researches not less diligent than your own, I cannot profess to think with you upon many speculative subjects, both of politics and of religion. But freedom of enquiry is equally open to you, and to myself: it is equally laudable in us, when conducted with impartiality and decorum; and it must equally tend to the enlargement of knowledge, and the improvement of virtue, while our sincerity does not betray us into precipitation, and while our zeal does not stifle within us the amiable and salutary

sentiments of mutual forbearance. Upon the points in which we dissent from each other, arguments will always secure the attention of the wise and good; whereas invective must disgrace the cause which we may respectively wish to support. But the principles upon which we are agreed are, surely, of a more exalted rank, and of more extensive importance, than those about which we differ; and while that importance is felt, as well as acknowledged, we shall welcome every argument, and resist every invective, from whatever quarter they may proceed.

We are convinced, I trust, as to the truth and authority of the Scriptures. But in the interpretation of them we must be sensible that the imperious and delusive infallibility which we refuse to others cannot be claimed by ourselves. We are satisfied, I presume, about the wisdom and utility of those fundamental principles that distinguish the mixed government under which an indulgent Providence has permitted our forefathers and ourselves to live. Yet, if one class of men are disposed to uphold the power of the crown, and another to enlarge the freedom of the people, we have no right to conclude that the former wish to be fettered with the chains of slavery, or that the latter are preparing to let loose the ravages of anarchy. The advocate for monarchy is not necessarily the foe of liberty, nor is the love of liberty incompatible with reverence for monarchy. Experience, indeed, soon puts to flight those chimerical accusations which issue from the narrow spirit of system, or the frantic vehe-

mence of party. In the hour of trial men cast away subordinate distinctions, as incumbrances to their understandings, and cleave to some vigorous and solid principle, which arrests their common notice, because it embraces their common interests. They cease to wrangle when they are called upon to act; and they look back with a mixture of amazement and contempt, even upon themselves, for all the cavils in which their vanity once exulted, and for all the reproaches by which their malignity was once gratified.

Through circumstances which are the result of accident more than design, through the prejudices of our education, through the habits of our thinking, through the conversation of our acquaintance, and sometimes it may be, through the authority of our teachers, difference of opinion will arise. But that difference, when carefully examined, often resolves itself only into a question of more or less, of fit or unfit, as to the time,—of proper or improper, as to the mode,—of probable or improbable, as to the consequence. It really turns, not upon the actual existence, or upon the general validity of principles themselves, but upon the degree in which they are applicable to some specific and controverted case. As, however, the solution of these difficulties must ever be dependent, not only upon the fluctuating nature of all worldly affairs, but upon the many or the few opportunities we have for observing their varying aspects, and upon the greater or less ability we employ to comprehend their relations and their effects, there must often

be room for suspense of judgment, and there will always be a call for the exercise of charity. On the other hand, impatience of contradiction is both weak and wicked. Instead of facilitating decision, it perpetuates contention. It darkens the evidences, and obstructs the efficacy of truth itself. It originates in a radical defect of judgment, and too often terminates in a most incorrigible intolerance of temper.

I doubt not, Gentlemen, but that you will allow the justness of these observations. I doubt not, but that you are impressed with a deep sense of their utility. But in the application of them to practice, we all see, and we all lament, very frequent instances of inconsistency or reluctance even among those persons who, in matters of theory, may justly pretend to the fullest information and the clearest conviction.

The situation, Gentlemen, in which you are placed, attracts the notice of all parties, and of all sects in your own country; and the conduct which you may pursue in that situation must exalt your characters to honour, or depress them with infamy, not only in your own age, but to posterity. By moderation in your opinions, and by prudence in your measures, you may disarm the prejudices of your enemies, secure the protection of your governors, and conciliate the favour of the virtuous and the enlightened. On the contrary, if you swell trifles into bulkiness by a superfluous and turbulent zeal—if you inflame the animosities which you ought to mitigate—if you persevere in a frivolous

or a pernicious contest, in which retreat would be less inglorious than victory, and victory is less probable than overthrow, the considerate part of your fellow-citizens will be at a loss to determine whether you are most to be condemned for the infatuation of your understandings, or for the perverseness of your dispositions.

You stand, Gentlemen, upon a high and an open theatre, where every action will be vigilantly noticed, and every motive severely scrutinized. You have more to hope from the stern and solicitous justice, than from the candour or partiality of those by whom you are observed. You have a very illustrious, and, perhaps, a very difficult part to perform. You are summoned to a triumph, not merely over the prepossessions of your calumniators, but over the excesses of your own passions. You are to vindicate and preserve your future reputation, by disproving the heavy charges which have been alleged against your past behaviour. You are to meet acquittal or condemnation from a most awful tribunal, the sentence of which has been hitherto suspended by uncertainty about what you have done, and compassion for what you have suffered. You are to convince a generous, but a discerning public, that peace is equally dear to you with liberty, that you have wisdom to concede, where concession is a duty, as well as firmness not to relax, where relaxation were a crime, that the doctrinal peculiarities of Unitarianism are perfectly compatible with the practical rules of Christianity, and that while you applaud the auspicious changes in the French govern-

ment, you meditate no direct or indirect injury to your own.

These plain but interesting considerations, Gentlemen, are presented to your view by a man who has risked, and would again risk, the imputation of singularity, of indecorum, and even apostacy, by doing to you what is just, and by speaking of you what is true. Though he does not profess himself an advocate of many of your tenets, he can, with sincerity, declare himself not an enemy to your persons. He knows only few among you, but he thinks well of many. He respects you for temperance and decency in private life; for diligence in your employments, and punctuality in your engagements—for economy without parsimony, and liberality without profusion—for the readiness you shew to relieve distress and to encourage merit, with little or no distinction of party—for the knowledge which many of you have acquired by the dedication of your leisure hours to intellectual improvement, and for the regularity with which most of you are said to attend religious worship. As to some late deplorable events, he believes that you have been misrepresented—he knows that you have been wronged—he deprecates the continuance of that misrepresentation, and he now calls upon your judgments, upon your feelings, and upon your consciences, to avert the repetition of those wrongs.

Such, Gentlemen, is the general purpose for which I take the liberty of addressing you; and in the sequel of this pamphlet you will find me state, without disguise, and without acrimony, my serious

opinion upon the particular event which has induced me thus to stand forward with the zeal, but not the arrogance of a counsellor, and with the fidelity, but not the blindness of a friend.

A report has for some time been circulated in this county, that you intend to commemorate the French Revolution upon the approaching 14th of July. Unwilling I was to believe that report, because I was unable to account for that intention. It seemed to me incredible that men, harassed as you have been by oppression, and loaded with obloquy, should deliberately rush into danger and disgrace; into danger which you cannot push aside, and disgrace which, after such an action hazarded at such a crisis, you would in vain endeavour to wipe away. For a time, therefore, I disbelieved, and I resisted the report. I supposed it to originate merely in conjectures of what you would do, arising from misapprehension of what you had already done. I ascribed the propagation of it to the busy and mischievous activity of partizans, who are desirous of alarming the ignorant, and of exasperating the prejudiced. I cast it into the common stock of those idle and slanderous rumours which rise up, we know not where, and disappear, we know not when. I gave you credit for common sense enough to perceive that such a measure, at such a time, was unsafe, and for common moderation enough to feel that it was unbecoming. In other men I should have called that measure criminal. In you, Gentlemen, I thought it impossible. But if my surprize was great, when I first received

the intelligence, how violent must have been the shock, how deep the concern I felt upon discovering, as I lately have done, that it was too well founded? The primitive Christians, in consequence of their invincible fortitude, were by some of their antagonists contemptuously named Biæothanati, and by others they were barbarously ridiculed, as homines desperatæ et deploratæ factionis. But they were actuated by an indisputably good spirit in a cause eminently good; in a cause which immediately concerned their duty and their salvation; in a cause, for the defence of which they were compelled to undergo persecution, though it does not appear that they were authorized to court it. But you, Gentlemen, appear to me to be shewing excessive hardiness upon a subject in which you are remotely and indirectly interested. You seem to provoke opposition, without an adequate object. I consider you as plunging into calamity where you have not the plea of discharging a duty. I think that for the guilt and the misery into which your enemies may be hurried, the chief responsibility must now recoil upon yourselves.

Permit me, then, to expostulate with you upon the only arguments which you, probably, can produce for asserting again your right to assemble, and at the same time to lay before you the reasons upon which I, without hesitation, and without apology, pronounce it your duty to refrain from the most perilous exercise of that most doubtful right.

It may be said, that you are not forbidden to meet by the laws of the land, and, therefore, that

your meeting is irreproachable. I admit the fact; but deny the consequence. A good man, doubtless, will not do any thing which the laws interdict. But will he therefore do every thing which the laws have not interdicted? Will he not consider that there is a spirit, as well as a letter, even in human laws? Will he, without discrimination and without restriction, infer the tacit approbation of persons who frame, or persons who administer laws, from the mere absence of direct and specific prohibition? Will he forget that an external action may sometimes be accompanied by motives and effects which, if the law-giver had foreseen them, would have met with the most pointed reprobation? Instead of rejoicing that penalties are not instituted of such a kind as to become equally snares to the harmless, and checks upon the froward, will he convert the caution or the lenity of the law-giver into an occasion of disturbing that order, the preservation of which is the supreme and avowed object of law itself? Will he lose sight of the judicious and temperate distinction which the Apostle has established between "things lawful and things not expedient?" Will he not remember, that as a social and a moral being he is under the control of obligations more powerful and more sacred than the best institutions of the best government? If, indeed, we examine the aggregate of those duties in which our virtue consists, and of those causes by which our well-being is promoted, small is the share which must be assigned to the efficacy of public regulations enforced by the sanctions of public authority. The

soft manners of civilized life, the useful offices of good neighbourhood, the sweet charities of domestic relation, are all independent of human laws. Such are the opinions which we hold, and have a right to propagate, upon abstract questions of politics. Such are the tenets we may adopt, and are warranted to defend, upon the foundations of virtue and the evidences of religion. Such are our attachments or antipathies to public men; such, our approbation or disapprobation of public measures. Such are our sentiments upon the nice gradations of decorum and propriety; such are our principles in estimating the mass of merit or demerit which determines the character of individuals. Upon all these subjects human laws hold out to us little light, they impose upon us few restraints, and yet, upon right apprehensions of these subjects, and upon the conformity of our actions to those apprehensions, depend our comfort, our reputation, our most precious interests in this world, and our dearest hopes in that which is to come.

There is not any one action, and scarcely is there any one thought affecting, or tending to affect, the happiness of mankind, upon which any one human being is entirely and strictly a law unto himself. There is a law of opinion which no good man will presume to treat with irreverence, because every good man is anxious to avoid the contempt, and to deserve the regard of his fellow-creatures. There is a law of discretion mingled with justice, which every good citizen is careful to observe, lest he should interrupt the tranquillity, or encroach upon

the equitable rights of his fellow-citizens. There is a law of religion which forbids us to insult the errors, or even to wound the prejudices, of our fellow Christians.

You, Gentlemen, understand not less clearly than myself the existence of such laws; you will acknowledge their importance not less sincerely; and you will admit that the perverse or wanton violation of them cannot be extenuated before man—cannot be justified before God, by the plea—yes, I must call it, the futile and fallacious plea, that we are acting under circumstances where human wisdom is too dim, and human authority too feeble to control our actions.

Here, then, a question arises whether the meeting which you intend to hold does, or does not, fall under the obligation of those laws which I have enumerated, and the neglect or observance of which you must yourselves confess to have a permanent and a visible influence in preserving or contaminating our innocence, in promoting or impeding our happiness, in entitling us to praise, or in covering us with dishonour. Now, in my opinion, Gentlemen, such a meeting is at variance with your duty as prudent men, with your duty as peaceable citizens, and with your duty as sincere Christians.

Many are the situations in which prudence itself is not only expedient but obligatory; and in the present state of things it is not the part of a prudent man for you to do again what you have already done, with so much loss of your property, and so much danger to your persons. It is not the

part of a peaceable citizen to provoke again those ferocious tempers, and those outrageous crimes, of which you have yourselves so lately and so largely experienced the dismal consequences. It is not the part of a sincere Christian to offend, without some weighty reason, even his weaker brethren. Much less is it his part to cast upon the rash and wild decision of passion those speculative questions which ought to be decided only by cool and impartial reason. Least of all is it his part, by an unnecessary and unprofitable experiment, practically to involve thousands in danger, and ten thousands in guilt.

Well do you know that, whether justly or unjustly, such an assembly will immediately bring into review your political and your religious notions, to the utmost possible extent, and under the utmost possible disadvantages. But in vain will you make professions of a general attachment to the laws and constitution of your country, when, for so trifling an end, you venture upon such proceedings as will induce other men to transgress those laws, and to maintain that none of you are well affected to that constitution. In vain will you insist upon your sincerity in the belief of the Gospel, when you throw snares and temptations in the way of other men, many of whom believe it with the same firmness, and contemplate it with the same reverence.

Be assured, Gentlemen, that I have felt disgust rather than conviction—disgust, I say, from the reproaches, rather than conviction from the arguments of certain persons, who would oppress you

with the entire, or even the chief responsibility for the events of the last disastrous year. Unlikely it was that you should foresee all those events in all their causes, and all their aggravations. It was unlikely that you should suspect certain machinations, which are said to have been formed against you in distant quarters. It was unlikely that you should calculate by your foresight, or even by your fears, what you have witnessed by your senses; I mean the most unexampled degradation of the national character, the Christian character, and the human character. But the plea of ignorance can be urged no longer. Experience has shewn you what men are under the tyranny of prejudice; experience has shewn you what they can be in defiance of law; and if that experience is lost upon your discretion or your humanity, every countenance will blush for your folly, every voice will be raised against your rashness, but for your sufferings—believe me, Gentlemen, for your sufferings, no heart, however tender, will hereafter mourn.

You will say, perhaps, that the opposition to you arises from narrow prepossessions, from base intrigues, from calumnious reports. Be it so. But if these evils do really hover around you, it becomes alike your interest and your duty to deliberate calmly upon the most proper and the most effectual methods of counteracting them. If you are surrounded by numerous enemies, remember, I beseech you, that resistance is fruitless, and that retaliation is vindictive. If you are watched by secret ruffians, consider that their machinations will be

defeated while you abstain from those measures which, upon a late occasion, made them successful. If you are annoyed by venomous slanderers, reflect that by doing again what you have done before you will furnish new materials for new accusations; and that by doing it under new circumstances you will throw around those accusations a more specious appearance, and give them a wider and more fatal effect.

I mean not, Gentlemen, to affirm or to deny that the evils of which you complain are so great as you represent them. But if I am to suppose them to exist upon the evidence of your own statement, I infer, from that very statement, the very strongest objections to your own intended conduct.

In the town where you reside there are many persons whose talents and whose virtues deserve your esteem, however widely they may dissent from you upon numberless questions, about which free enquirers into truth, and the inhabitants of a free country, ever have differed, and ever will differ. These men will not listen with a willing ear, when your reputations are rudely attacked. Their bosoms are not callous while they reflect upon those melancholy scenes, when your families were forced from their homes, when your property was plundered, when your houses were consumed in a conflagration which deepened the horrors of the night, and drove back even the splendor of the sun in open day. But, if you meet again, the candid doubts of these men, as to the intention of your former meeting, will be supplanted by indignant suspicions, and their pity

for your former sufferings will be exchanged for disgust and abhorrence.

I meddle not with the controversy going on between Dr. Priestley and the clergy of your town, so far as it relates to those circumstances which preceded, or those which followed the riots. But those clergymen have professed openly and unanimously to lament the misfortunes which befel you. They have condemned the tumultuous and savage proceedings of a misguided rabble. They have asserted with firmness their own opinions, and with sincerity, I would hope, they have disclaimed all right of control over yours. To some of them you are indebted for well-intended exertions in the hour of distress, and against none have you brought any accusations for encouraging the popular fury at that juncture, when the act of encouraging it would have been most disgraceful indeed to them, but most injurious to yourselves. Individually, as you well know, one of them is much respected for the depth of his learning, another for the elegance of his manners, a third for the cheerfulness of his temper, and a fourth for the liberality of his spirit. In a collective point of view, they are men who draw down no disgrace upon their sacred profession, either by the neglect of their clerical offices, or by flagrant indecorum, or by habitual vice. Give them the credit then, I beseech you, of having some regard for the honour of the church to which they belong, for the tranquillity of the town in which they live, for the safety even of the congregations which they are *not* employed to instruct,

and, above all, let me add, for the morals and the souls of multitudes who are committed to their charge.

By sermons or controversial writings they have bereaved you, it will be said, eventually of those precepts which you have been accustomed to hear, and of that example which you have been accustomed to admire in a most venerable preacher, for whom it is no longer safe to preside over a flock, endeared to him by ancient habits of familiarity, and connected with him by many personal, many political, and many religious ties. Into the truth of this allegation, it were invidious and impertinent for me to enquire. But the Scriptures, you will consider, still lie open to you. The house in which you did homage to your Creator will soon be rebuilt. The same freedom which you formerly enjoyed in opinion and in worship, is at this hour secured to you by the laws; and though you cannot again obtain the honour and advantage you derived from such an instructor as Dr. Priestley, your sect is hardly so barren of excellence as not to supply you with a successor, whose talents, indeed, may be less flattering to your honest pride, but whose labours will not be less meritorious in discharging the duties of his clerical station, nor less instrumental in making all of you "wise unto salvation."

I should not think well of your sensibility, if you were indifferent to the loss of so excellent a preacher as Dr. Priestley. But I shall think very ill of your moderation, if you make that loss a pretext for perpetuating disputes, which, if my

arguments or my prayers could prevail, would speedily have an end.

Upon the theological disputes in which the Doctor has been engaged with some clergymen of your town, I forbear to give any opinion. Yet, while I disclaim all allusion to local events, I will make you a concession which you have my leave to apply to persons of higher ranks as ecclesiastics, and of greater celebrity as scholars, than your town can supply; I confess with sorrow that in too many instances such modes of defence have been used against this formidable Heresiarch, as would hardly be justifiable in the support of Revelation itself, against the arrogance of a Bolingbroke, the buffoonery of a Mandeville, and the levity of a Voltaire. But the cause of orthodoxy requires not such aids. The Church of England approves them not—the spirit of Christianity warrants them not. Let Dr. Priestley, indeed, be confuted where he is mistaken. Let him be exposed where he is superficial. Let him be repressed where he is dogmatical. Let him be rebuked where he is censorious. But let not his attainments be depreciated, because they are numerous almost without a parallel. Let not his talents be ridiculed, because they are superlatively great. Let not his morals be vilified, because they are correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation—because they present even to common observers the innocence of a Hermit, and the simplicity of a Patriarch, and because a philosophic eye will at once discover in them the deep-fixed root of virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit.

If I mistake not the character of that excellent man, whom I respect in common with yourselves, he would not wish to see you again plunged into mischiefs which cannot again reach himself. Spare then his blushes and his tears. Give him the satisfaction of knowing that you have proved to the world the wholesome efficacy of his instructions, by your generosity in forgiving those who have already been your enemies, and by your wisdom in not offending those who wish to continue your friends.

About the effects of your intended meeting there can be little doubt; nay, I should rather affirm that there can be no doubt, but that the effects will be far more tremendous than the effects of your former meeting, and I ground these positions, not only upon the general characters of men, but upon some particular events which among yourselves have been subjects of complaint.

The age in which we live is distinguished not only for an active and useful spirit of enquiry, but by a fastidious and fantastic turn of mind which soothes us into self-approbation while we deplore surrounding evils, and contemplate distant good. I say not that these illusions may not sometimes prepare us for virtuous action, when opportunities for acting exist. But I fear that, in too many cases, the imagination is indulged, while the heart is not improved. Upon topics relating to public as well as private life, in studying speculative politics, as well as in reading sentimental novels, we are often the dupes of secret vanity, and applaud our-

selves for ideal or inactive philanthropy. When no interest is to be renounced, no passion to be curbed, no froward humour to be thwarted, we embrace truth wheresoever we find it, and in theory become the warm and strenuous advocates of virtue. But in practice, our exertions fall very short of the rules we have prescribed to ourselves and to our fellow-creatures, and though we are really invested with the power of doing good, we either neglect to do it at all, or we are content to do it with that reluctance and languor which we have been accustomed to condemn in other men. Prepossessions blind us—antipathies harden us—passion hurries us into faults, and self-delusion soon provides us with an excuse. Now, Gentlemen, as many of your teachers are eminent for having contributed to the general stock of knowledge, and as you are yourselves distinguished by an eagerness to defend and to propagate it, beware lest the want of consistency should lead men to charge upon you the want of sincerity.

You and I must often have looked with sorrow upon the situation of the poor, pinched as they are by want, exposed to delusion, mortified by neglect, irritated by oppression, bewildered in the mazes of error, and involved in the darkness of ignorance. And is it a proof, then, of your compassion for their miseries, or of your solicitude for their improvement, that, knowing the lower classes of your townsmen to be still under the dominion of the same unhappy prejudices, you will again provoke them to the same horrible excesses? I lament, Gentlemen, the unhappy end of those wretches who suf-

fered for the riots; and can it be your wish, that the dreadful severity of the laws should be inflicted again? The public seems not perfectly satisfied with the acquittal of some persons, who, by means known or unknown, honourable or dishonourable, were rescued from punishment. But is it a mark of your reverence for the laws, that you would again cause them to be evaded, and insulted by evasion? Will Juries, think ye, be more impartial between the prosecutor and the prisoner? Will Judges be more favourable to the one? Will the Sovereign be more rigorous towards the other? No. No. They will see obstinacy hereafter, where they before might only see indiscretion. They will consider you as meeting in defiance of common opinion—as risking a great and a certain evil for a very uncertain, and a very trifling good—as exposing your houses, your persons, and your families, without the impulse of provocation, and without the prospect of advantage—as calling for justice upon those whom you have yourselves precipitated into crimes—as staking the pleasures of one afternoon's entertainment, or the exercise of one petty right, against what? against laws which you know will be transgressed—against lives which you know will be forfeited—against the credit of yourselves, and of others who may hold the same political opinions with yourselves—against the counsel of the wise, the arguments of the moderate, and the entreaties of the humane—against the safety of your houses and your children—against the judgment and the quiet of your neighbours—against the property and

e persons of all the various inhabitants of a great d a prosperous town.

Under such circumstances, Gentlemen—circumances which you cannot but yourselves foresee—rcumstances of which you probably have been formed by other men—circumstances of which ou are now most solemnly forewarned by me. What, let me ask you, can be your claims upon the stice or upon the compassion of your countryen? In point of law you may be entitled to proction and redress. But in point of common sense ou ought to see that such protection will be reluct nt, and that such redress will be scanty. After a cond meeting you will experience many galling ortifications from which you hitherto have been ee. Your cause will no longer be the cause of en "who seek peace and ensue it." Your sufferngs will not be the sufferings of persecuted innonce. Your dishonour will be extensive, it will be sting, it will be just.

I beseech you, Gentlemen, when you read the regoing sentences, not to misconceive the temper which they are written, not to confound the rnestness of remonstrance with the fierceness of cusation, not to turn away from me as a declamary prattler, nor to frown upon me as a virulent lumniator, but to listen to me, I had almost said, a prophet, and I do say as a friend.

Your own good sense will, I am persuaded, tell ou, that upon the circumstances of the agent must ten depend the quality of the action. And give e leave to observe, that the circumstances in which

you are placed are such as merit the most serious consideration from you as individuals, as partizans, as subjects who owe obedience to your government, and as citizens who wish for an enlargement of your liberties. Look around, I conjure you, at the storm which is gathering in every part of Europe—at the dangers which impend over the new constitution of France, and at the alarm which has spread, and daily is spreading more and more, throughout the British empire. The tenets of Mr. Paine, most of which I despise as vulgar, and detest as seditious, are gaining ground among the ignorant and discontented. The fears of moderate, and sensible men too, are awakened by those opinions. The indignation of good men is stirred up against them—the wisdom of parliament has unanimously pronounced a sentence of reprobation upon their principles. The vigilance of government is pointed, and its strength too, I hope, is armed against their possible effects. Surely, then, I need not expatiate upon the probability that your meeting will, by many well-meaning and well-informed men, be associated with the very tenets which Mr. Paine is endeavouring to propagate; and if this be the case, the public voice may pronounce a late parliamentary decision very just, though, in the estimation of many intelligent individuals, it is now considered as harsh. If you persist in your resolution to assemble, what you may reasonably hope will be refused to you, in consequence of the apprehensions which will be entertained of what you most unreasonably meditate.

Perilous it will be thought to grant, and fruitless even to discuss that which you openly claim, while you raise up against yourselves a swarm of suspicions about that which you secretly intend. If, therefore, you really wish to be relieved from the pressure of those rigorous acts which hang over the heads of Unitarians, do not frighten benevolent and loyal men from becoming your advocates. Do not suffer your religious tenets to be confounded with the seeming tendency of your political opinions united with your political actions. Do not furnish a triumph to those who have hitherto insulted you perhaps without a cause, and censured you without a proof. The justice of your claims, depend upon it, will at this moment be measured by the violence or the calmness of your proceedings. And from your meeting, after what you have experienced, it will be inferred, that, instead of meaning solely to celebrate the French Revolution, you are not unwilling to encourage such notions, and to excite such disorders, as eventually may accelerate a Revolution among ourselves. Far, very far, be it from me to charge you with such an intention; and far, also, be it from me to slight the terrors, or to condemn the indignation of other men, whom your future conduct after the events of last year, and during the appearances of the present, may induce to load you with such an imputation. If, therefore, you are friends to order, as I believe you are, endeavour to preserve it. If you are enemies to excessive innovations, abstain from the very appearance of promoting them. If you wish for the favour of go-

vernment, and the approbation of your fellow-citizens, let not a dinner, or the right of eating a dinner upon a certain day, or in a certain place, be thought too considerable a sacrifice for the attainment of these substantial and permanent advantages. Gentlemen, for peculiar and obvious reasons, you cannot avail yourselves of a plea which some men have urged in your favour. I will lay it before you, and then I will tell you why you cannot avail yourselves of it. If other men dine, as they probably will in other places, to commemorate the French Revolution, why may not you do the same thing with the same impunity? Consider, I entreat you, the motto which is prefixed to this pamphlet—in appearance non dissimilis res est; I grant it to be so. But then the circumstances of him qui facit, must be taken into the account. There is not, if I may believe your own representations, so strong a spirit of intolerance in many other places as for some time past has reigned at Birmingham. There have not been riots in other places, as there have been at Birmingham. There have not been civil prosecutions, and criminal prosecutions in other places, as there have been in this county against the inhabitants of Birmingham. The same suspicions are not entertained of other men in other places, as are entertained of you at Birmingham. The same restraints do not exist upon the disposition of other men to hold a second meeting in other places which now do exist at Birmingham. My wishes are, that no such meetings may be holden in any place, because they are useless to the reformers of France,

and offensive to many worthy men at home. But with whatever propriety, and whatever effect they may be holden in other places, the action is not the same in your town, because, as I have told you, the situation of the agents is not the same.

When the folly or the wisdom of man has arbitrarily connected certain signs with certain overt-acts, they who know, as you do, the connection between the sign and the thing signified, will in vain attempt to sever them by the subtilties of discrimination, or the confidence of denial. I see no necessary union between the tenets of Unitarianism and very enlarged notions of political liberty. But the fact is, that both are to be found in the same men, and when the passions of ignorant persons are once inflamed, their imagination will pass by a rapid transition from one to the other, and the odium which is cast upon your religion, will rebound upon your politics. In a general way of statement, I should not at first have a doubt why they who assembled together quietly and parted soon last year, should not do the same in the present year: and I am persuaded that it is your inclination to do the same. But the prejudices and the apprehensions of your neighbours will not permit you to do so, and because you are all perfectly sensible of the terrible effects which must arise from such prejudices and apprehensions, my cool and settled judgment is, that you are responsible for such effects. You, perhaps, will plead, that you did no harm and meant no harm—but there will be numbers ready to reply, that trifling actions have,

and are intended to have, momentous effects; that he who defaced the Emperor's statue was justly punished, because he meant an indirect indignity to the Emperor himself, that so much ardour, and so much perseverance would not be shewn in commemorating the French Revolution, if they were not mingled with secret wishes for similar events in a nearer quarter. Gentlemen, I would not insinuate that you have such wishes—I believe that all, or the greater part of you never harboured them for one moment. But they who live in your neighbourhood, and who will sit in judgment upon your measures, may not deliver a sentence quite so favourable as my own; and where you have so little chance of justice, why will you expose yourselves to flagrant and inevitable injustice?

What, I beseech you, can be the end you propose to yourselves in this entertainment? To indulge in revelry and intemperance cannot be the end, for your characters are marked by the opposite virtues of sobriety and regularity. It cannot be to proclaim your sentiments about the Revolution in France, for they are already known, and already reprobated, too, by those to whom they are imperfectly known. It cannot be to multiply converts, for conversion is rarely effected by the unpopular meetings of unpopular men. It cannot be to assert your freedom of thinking upon a subject, where, for better purposes than meeting at a dinner, you are already free. Study, if you please, the French Revolution in your closets, discuss the principles and the detail of it in your conversation, explain

them when misconceived, defend them when misrepresented. Celebrate, if you please, the glorious destruction of the Bastile in your own private houses—pour forth your praises upon the framers and the supporters of the French government—lift up your prayers to Heaven for the final success of the French arms. All this, Gentlemen, will be allowed to you, not only by the laws of the land, but by the laws of opinion. No peaceable man will, for this, condemn you. In this many enlightened men will sympathize with you. But if you have so little regard for the loyal sentiments, or even the rooted prejudices of your neighbours, so little feeling about your own personal security, so little respect for the general approbation of your countrymen, so little caution in the critical state of your country itself, as in defiance of reproach, and in defiance of persecution, to assemble again; where is the man of virtue who can approve of your cause, or where the man of wisdom who can be satisfied with your excuse?

It may be suggested, that for not assembling, as you meant to do, you will be charged with dastradly submission. But by whom, Gentlemen, will this charge be alledged? Sure I am that it never will proceed from men of sound wisdom, and of pure honour, to whose sentence it becomes you to make your first and your last appeal. From whom then will it proceed? From silly men, whom you ought to despise; from impetuous men, whom you ought only to pity and to restrain; or from factious men, whom you ought not to imitate. But what, after

all, do we discover in this term submission, which seems to delude and to scare so large a part of mankind? One being, indeed, there is, whom a poet of your own country has thus described in language most luminous and most sublime:—

> "Is there no place for pardon left?
> None left but by submission, and that word
> Disdain forbids me, and the dread of shame
> Among the spirits beneath, whom I seduced,
> With other promises and other vaunts
> Than to submit."

True it is of too many reasonable creatures, and too many nominal Christians, that even they are sometimes driven onward to perdition and to infamy, by this infernal spirit of false pride, false courage, and imaginary fidelity to a bad or a doubtful cause. But God forbid that I should impute to you such a spirit, or discover in you even the slightest vestiges of such a spirit. I cannot suspect you of such fatuity, as to be pledged for holding a second assembly—I will not accuse you of such phrenzy as to redeem your pledge, by the loss of your reputation, or by the hazard of your existence. To whom, also, Gentlemen, is this tribute to be now paid by yourselves? Grant that it were, to a violent rabble whom you can neither appease nor resist—submission would be an act of consummate prudence. Suppose that it were to the excessive, but I will not add the dishonest prejudices of enemies and tories—submission would then approach to the dignity of virtue.—But if it were, as in reality it is, to be paid to the wishes of your friends, to the

safety of your relations, to the good order of your town, and to the general tranquillity of your country; then, doubtless, submission rises into a real virtue, into a virtue of the first magnitude, into a virtue of the brightest splendour. Its nature cannot be misunderstood, its motive cannot be traduced, it will be imputed to magnanimity, it will be crowned with praise. Farther let me ask, what is the sacrifice that you are making by such submission? Is it any political opinion? No. Is it any religious tenet? No. Is it any secular interest? No. It is a dinner, Gentlemen, it is only a dinner, and when I reflect upon the trifle it is in itself, or upon the applause you will gain by renouncing it, or upon the danger you will incur by contending for it, I will not offer such an indignity to your good sense, as to press this part of the subject with one word more of illustration or remonstrance.

Gentlemen, in the intention of your friends, and in the conduct of your enemies, you will find precedents, such as will justify the relinquishment of your purpose, or I should rather say, examples, such as will exclude your perseverance in it from justification.

If I am to believe Mr. Dadley, several respectable Dissenters last year were disposed to give up their meeting, lest the town should be disturbed. If I am to believe your Clergy, the proposal for assembling at a public dinner in opposition to yours, was abandoned at the same critical time for the same weighty reason. But if some of your friends, and some of your foes shewed so much attention to

the quiet of your town when the temper of the common people was known imperfectly, and by mere conjecture, it is incumbent upon you to shew more attention to the preservation of that quiet, when the violence of that temper is known to you completely, and by melancholy experience. If the Church and King party then understood their real dignity, and preserved it by receding from an ideal, or an imperfect right, let it not be said of the Dissenters, that with such an instructive example before them, they now insult the very persons by whom they were not themselves insulted—that they are more desirous to incur the censure than to merit the approbation even of their opponents—that they mistake contumacy for firmness, and rashness for heroism. If Churchmen shrunk from the guilt of hurting a party, let Dissenters shudder at the greater guilt of embroiling a nation!

There is, I confess, one plausible argument which hitherto has been untouched. I will state it for you strongly, and fairly I will answer it. They, whom you suppose, whether justly or unjustly, to be your enemies, have instituted a society under the appellation of the Church and King Club, and the tendency, you say, of that society is to encrease and to perpetuate the odium which has been excited against you. Gentlemen, I see little in the tendency of that society which as a friend to the quiet of my neighbourhood, or to the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of this land, I can reasonably commend. But I also see nothing in the proceedings, or the professions of that society, which can possibly jus-

ify you for meeting upon the fourteenth of July. et me again remind you of my motto.—They assemble, and you assemble. But the persons assembling are different, and though it may be said rith truth, that while their purpose is to support overnment, yours is not to weaken it; still, Gentlemen, there are many circumstances which will ead to very different constructions, of assemblies rhich in appearance, and in appearance only, are he same. You meet to celebrate the French revoution, which they certainly do not. They meet, erhaps, to discourage an English revolution, which s certainly you do not. Their cause is popular in he town, and yours is not. A precedent, then, their ssembly cannot be called for yours, and I am qually at a loss to discover how it should be a jusification.

Were I to grant you that they meet very often, nd were I ex hypothesi, to grant yet farther, that he spirit with which they meet is not very friendly o you, I am still unable in their conduct to find an pology for yours. The majority of the town, in all robability, views their meeting with a favourable ye.—But the minority have nothing to fear from t, while their own behaviour is circumspect and emperate. Many persons may be unwilling to beieve that a system of unrelenting opposition is inended to be carried on against the Dissenters. Nay I am myself disposed to hope, that not one member of that club can seriously wish to see your persons gain in danger, or your houses in flames. But whatever may be their intention, and whatever their

wishes, still it is in your power to counteract them by refraining from that perilous measure which it is the purpose of this address to reprobate and to prevent. By forbearing to meet only for one day, upon your own parts, you may defeat the collective stratagems and the collected malignity of many meetings upon theirs. This observation I ground even upon your own statement, for be it remembered that it is you, not myself, who accuse them of such stratagems and such malignity. If they are innocent, I congratulate them. But if they are guilty, I shall not acquit you, because the proof of that guilt must be accompanied by circumstances which may equally tend to disgrace both you and them. They, gentlemen, even if they have not a better cause, may bring forward a stronger plea. They may contend, that the spirit which they have long observed and long resisted in you is not yet subdued, that it rises superior to difficulty and danger, that it challenges instead of shunning persecution, that it has incited opposition by past appearances, and that by realities avowed at the present hour such opposition is amply and notoriously justified. Whether or no, I should myself admit, either the sincerity or the validity of this reasoning, is of no consequence—it is sufficient for my purpose that they are likely to employ it, and that you may not be able entirely to refute it.

Reflect, then, I entreat you, upon the aggravated mischiefs which must flow from the measure you are said to intend, and consider that you become yourselves strictly and immediately answer-

able for the whole extent of those mischiefs, if you distinctly foresee them, and foreseeing them are unalterably determined to provoke them. There are situations in which events become so probable as to carry with them all the evidences, and to draw after them all the moral obligations of practical certainty. There are causes, which, however trifling or harmless in the common course of the world, may from temporary or local circumstances be pregnant with the most baneful effects. But when those effects may be justly apprehended, they cannot be innocently hazarded. The club of which you complain, may have been at the expence of much trouble in collecting the gunpowder, and of much contrivance in laying the train. But it is you, gentlemen, who apply the fire to it; and upon whom the explosion may fall—Oh! consider this!—upon whom the explosion may fall, can be known only to that Being who seeth "events afar off."

If senseless prepossessions or merciless animosities still prevail among you, can it be supposed that a meeting on the fourteenth July will either correct the one or assuage the other? No. But by forbearing to assemble, you will at least hold out to the public a bright and unequivocal proof that prejudices and animosities ought from henceforth to subside.

It is chiefly from your own representation of your own cause, that I infer the certainty and the greatness of your own danger. If too many offenders were acquitted upon trial, or too few were punished after condemnation, the terrors of the law

are diminished among the lower classes of the community. If the damages allowed you upon your late prosecutions, were too little, you must in future look even for less. They who attacked you before, will certainly not be intimidated from attacking you now. They who hated you upon the bare suspicion of a turbulent temper or of an unbecoming behaviour, will not cease to hate you after proceedings which, in their judgments, will constitute a decisive proof both of the one and of the other.

Since the late riots there has been little appearance of actual reconciliation, or indeed of the slightest dispositions in any of the contending parties to be reconciled. After the lapse of many months, we have heard only of crimination and recrimination, of what you intended to do, and what your enemies have done, of justice, which, as you say, has been imperfectly dispensed to you, and which, as others say, has been dispensed even beyond your deserts. These different statements affect differently the public mind. But however divided that public may be upon past events, it will have one judgment, one feeling, and one voice, if, in contempt of the very plainest and very worst consequences, you do again, what I believe you have done before, without any sense of guilt, without any intention of committing injury, and without any certain prospect of being injured. A second meeting will avert from you the good opinion and the good wishes of those who disdained to join in the clamours that were raised against your first, and this consideration alone you ought

not to neglect. Even if a riot should not happen to sweep away your property, still your reputation will be stigmatized on account of such steps as tend to provoke a riot.

There are many persons who believe the causes of the late riots to be very deep: many who have wondered at your vehemence in complaint, when compared with your supineness in action: many who have been taught to suppose you in possession of stubborn proofs against persons generally unknown or generally unsuspected; many who feel a strong mixture of amazement and scorn, that those boasted proofs have not been brought into open day for the satisfaction of the doubtful, the confutation of the malevolent, and the conviction of the guilty. The suppression of these proofs, if such they be, impartial men are at a loss to reconcile to the known motives and the known tenour of human conduct. They cannot reconcile it to your declarations of having obtained evidence, and to your menaces of inflicting punishment. They cannot reconcile it to the reliance you are reported to have upon the protection and the advice of administration, or to the confidence you profess to feel in the justice of your cause. But if you persist in sheltering those whom you have already accused, and then proceed to irritate those whom you may accuse hereafter, most difficult will it be for you to explain these seeming inconsistencies upon any received principles of upright intention. The unprejudiced observer will be confounded and offended at so much obscurity, combined with so much precipi-

tation. The airy witling will exclaim, that however you may reject mysteries in matters of faith, you retain them in matters of practice. Gentlemen, you will excuse me for expostulating with so much freedom. Often have I condemned the violence of your persecutors, and the asperity of your accusers—I have lamented, almost as often, a want of openness or a want of firmness * in some respectable persons among yourselves. But if you venture to rush upon new dangers, instead of overwhelming with disgrace the real and secret authors of your past sufferings, I must think your temerity greater than your fortitude—I must in respect to the strength of your charges, substitute distrust for belief—in regard to the motives of your conduct, I must exchange apology for condemnation.

The foregoing considerations I chiefly address to your prudence. But there yet remain other and weightier matters, which I must hold up, at once,

---

* Some observations in this paragraph are in part obviated by the judicious, though ineffectual, attempt which Mr. Whitbread has lately made to bring the subject of the riots before the legislature. But the very application of the Dissenters for redress of past injuries, constitutes, surely, an additional and most powerful reason for their circumspection. It will appear to many persons a trick upon the justice, and an affront to the authority of parliament, for men to ask for protection at the very moment in which they are hurrying to the precipice of destruction unnecessarily, voluntarily, and therefore criminally. Though parliament may have been wrong in refusing an enquiry, the Dissenters at Birmingham cannot be right in adopting such measures as must prevent that enquiry from being resumed with propriety, and pursued with success.

to your prudence, and to your conscience. Let me then entreat, that you would seriously throw back your attention upon what is past, and that with equal seriousness you would consider what is about to come.

In the past you have seen your furniture plundered—your papers rifled—your houses destroyed, by an unthinking and unfeeling multitude. But the evils to come, I say it again, the evils to come will be more numerous in their immediate, and more baneful in their ultimate consequences. The unruly passions of the contending parties have been inflamed by many distant, and by some recent events. The blood of those who have perished, in what the vulgar think a righteous cause, will, from the vulgar, call aloud for expiation. The mischiefs which burst out suddenly, and raged wildly, in a former year, will in the present year be arrayed with circumstances of hideous preparation. Among your enemies, fresh and greater provocations will be followed up by fresh and greater outrages — violence will be repelled by violence—life will be staked against life—the fire which falls upon your own houses, will spread to the houses of your offending and unoffending townsmen. The havoc which breaks out in one town, will, in one or two days, pour its fury through the whole neighbourhood—what shoots up a tumult in one county, may in one month, or even in one week, grow into a rebellion through a whole kingdom.

Be not in haste, Gentlemen, to impute these representations to the colouring of a heated imagination, rather than to the dictates of sober reason.

More worthy would it be of your understandings to reflect upon the probability, and magnitude of the disasters which I have described; and more would it redound to the praise of your moderation to avoid all share in the guilt of such measures as unquestionably are likely to produce such disasters.

It is the common refuge of detected folly or disappointed obstinacy to say that men first predict evils because they wish them to come to pass, and then cause them to come to pass by the alarm which accompanies prediction. But for my part, Gentlemen, I disdain to meet such trite and contemptible sophistry with the solemnity of denial or the formalities of refutation. It is condescension enough, and more than enough, to notice an objection, which the weakest man among you is incapable of believing, and which the hardiest man among you would be unwilling to utter concerning myself. Whether I were to publish or to suppress these well-meant suggestions, the loyalists at Birmingham will be displeased at your meeting, the rabble will be incensed at your meeting, and the soldiers might catch the general contagion. By suppressing my pamphlet I might leave you to indulge the delusive hope of escaping opposition or of quelling it. But by publishing that pamphlet I may awaken in you the wise and virtuous resolution of not deserving to be opposed. Amidst the reports, then, which I hear of your design, and the prospect which I have of your danger, I cannot hesitate for one moment between the two alternatives. Expostulation, at the worst, were only a weakness, but silence must be a crime.

You will believe me not very indifferent about the subject upon which I address you, when I say that the intention of writing this pamphlet was formed on Sunday night last, in consequence of some intelligence which then reached me, and that the act of writing it was begun and finished in the course of the next day. But after bestowing upon the contents two revisals, I found very little which it was then of importance for me to add to the preceding parts of this address, and nothing which it was necessary for me to omit, or even to soften. I, therefore, without farther delay sent the manuscript to press; for as the matter was so intelligible and so interesting, I would not affront your understandings by lavishing decorations upon the style. Suspect me not of any intention to alter or to stifle your opinions about the French Revolution. Many parts of that Revolution I myself approve, after calm and serious examination. But no one part of it would I eagerly adopt as a model for imitation in this country. To me it seems safe and wise to wait for those gradual changes which the spirit of freedom, enlightened as it must be by French experiments, whether they be immediately successful or fruitless, and invigorated as it will be by French arms, whether they be victorious or defeated, will most assuredly produce in the temper of every government and in the judgment of every people.

Within a few days after this book had been committed to the press some events burst forth which ought, I am sure, to drive you from your present purpose, and to increase your future circumspection.

The precaution of reading the riot act, which most unpardonably was not taken to protect your houses of worship and your dwelling houses, has been taken very seasonably for the protection of brothel houses. The military force, which in consequence of proper information given in proper time to proper persons, ought to have been on the spot to prevent the riots in July 1791, fortunately was at hand to suppress the riots of May 1792. But whether the magistrates would be equally active, or the soldiers equally zealous in defending you from consequences which you certainly must have foreseen, and easily might have avoided, are points upon which your doubts, probably, are gloomier than my own. And can you, then, conceive a situation more humiliating, than that, in the hour of distress, conscientious Unitarians should be thought less worthy of succour than the shameless prostitute, the desperate bully, and the execrable procuress?

Narrow must have been the foresight, and rooted must have been the prejudices, of those persons who could either think with indifference, or talk with exultation of the disturbances by which, in the course of last year, the national police and the national character were alike disgraced. For reasons which at once excite the compassion of the benevolent, and call for the vigilance of the powerful, the lower classes of every community, are in every age too prone to violence. Permitted I must be to add, with my usual openness, though without any intentional rudeness to you or to your opponents, that in Birmingham there are many physical and moral,

many latent and prominent, many inveterate and recent causes by which the passions of your inferiors are become more ferocious than in other towns of equal or superior magnitude. To men of serious and impartial observation it is unnecessary for me to point out those causes, and to the superficial or the captious they would be pointed out in vain—intense labour succeeded by frequent and systematic intervals of idleness and intemperance—political animosities in those who have not even a glimmering of political knowledge—religious antipathies among those who attend not religious worship—inflammatory pamphlets and corrupt examples—the expectation of that impunity which has already been obtained for rioters—the idea of merit to government strangely associated with the commission of crimes against law. These, Gentlemen, are circumstances which peculiarly distinguish the condition of your common people—which loudly demand such exertions as, I trust, will hereafter be made by their spiritual instructors—and which more especially require such caution, delicacy, and moderation, as, I hope, will not be neglected by yourselves. In alluding to these circumstances I mean not to insult the poor—many a tear have I shed for their sorrows, and many plea have I framed for their faults—rather would I preserve their innocence than destroy their lives—I would rather see them enlightened and softened by the law of God than scourged and crushed by the laws of man—my compassion is due to the poor, but my indignation is reserved for those wretches by whom the poor are deluded or inflamed.

It is a trite maxim that the mass of the people, however weakly they may reason, are capable of feeling justly. But the misfortune is, that when they have proceeded to act they seldom continue to feel, or that their feelings are at once excessive in degree and criminal in kind. Hence, in the support of a favourite cause no enquiry is made about the point where right terminates and wrong begins. Humanity is then extinguished by zeal, and zeal is alike increased by triumph and by defeat. After habitual reverence for the rights of individuals and the laws of a country is overcome by temporary circumstances, and the spirit of misrule has once burst its bonds, every slight rumour, every sudden misconception, every allurement from immediate advantage, every provocation from seeming hostility, will be sufficient to change its direction, without diminishing its vigour. The passions of the multitude are fickle as well as impetuous; or if exempt, in some particular cases, from fickleness, they become more untameable from stubbornness.

That fury which a great provocation has lately turned against the corrupters of good morals, may by a less provocation be pointed with yet greater violence against the followers of an unpopular religion, and before its strength is spent in the extirpation of Dissenters, it may suddenly be hurried by the lust of rapine, or even by the mere wantonness of success into outrage against Churchmen. All parties, therefore, and all sects, are equally interested in discouraging this propensity to riot, by persuasion, in repressing it by resistance, and in

averting it by an inoffensive, temperate, and amicable behaviour. Uncandid it were, indeed, to suppose that Churchmen will not be roused by a sense of danger to a sense of duty. It were equally uncharitable to believe, that finding the same turbulent disposition still raging among the same misguided populace, Dissenters will shew themselves insensible to every danger, and regardless of every duty. The cry of Church and King has, you know, been lately heard in broken and indistinct murmurs, and if you meet again to commemorate the French Revolution, that cry will again thunder in your ears, when the storm of public indignation is collected to one point, and when they upon whom it falls with the surest aim, and with the greatest force, will be left to perish without refuge and without hope.

It is for you, Gentlemen, and not for myself, to reap either honour or advantage from the relinquishment of your intended measures, and the renunciation of your supposed right. As I give not my name to the public, you will have the satisfaction of yielding only to the force of my reasoning; and even if I were to reveal that name, I believe that some worthy persons among you would not be ashamed of shewing some little deference to the mere personal authority of the writer himself.

That writer is a lover of peace; and of liberty, too, he is a most ardent lover, because liberty* is

* Et nomen pacis dulce est, et ipsa res salutaris; sed inter pacem et servitutem plurimum interest; pax est tranquilla libertas.—Cicero, Philippic II.

the best means by which real peace can be obtained and secured. He therefore looks down with scorn upon every species of bigotry, and from every degree of persecution he shrinks with horror—he believes that, wheresoever imperious and turbulent teachers have usurped an excessive ascendancy over the minds of an ignorant and headstrong multitude, religion will always be disgraced, morals always vitiated, and society always endangered. But the real interests, the real honour, the real and most important cause of the Established Church he ever has supported, and will support, as he also ever has contended, and will contend, in favour of a liberal, efficient, and progressive toleration. He confounds not the want of confidence in the measures of an administration with the want of respect for the principles of a government. He distinguishes between dutiful obedience and abject servility to that regal power which, in this country, he holds to be not only conducive but essential to the public welfare. He is not much in the habit of resigning his judgment to the forebodings of the timid, the insinuations of the crafty, or the clamours of the malevolent—yet he looks, perhaps, with no narrow line of foresight towards events which may be approaching, and upon the present situation of the British empire he cannot reflect without a pause—without a pang—without jealousy of every opinion that may shake the fair fabric of our constitution—without abhorrence of every measure that may deluge this land of freedom in blood.

In regard to yourselves, Gentlemen, he means to

warn rather than censure—the effect of that warning he consigns to your own wisdom, and to the unsearchable will of that Providence in submission to which he has ever found the most solid comfort. But in giving you that warning he has an entire confidence in the purity of his motives: in enforcing it he boldly appeals to the justness of his arguments: and upon concluding it, he is at this moment conscious of having discharged a most important duty to you and your neighbours, to the Church and the State, to his country and his GOD.

May 17, 1792.

N.B. For Biæothanati, which is used by Tertullian and Biothanati, which is the more common word, the reader is referred to Suicer's Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, page 690.

WARBURTONIAN TRACTS.

THE publication by Dr. Parr, styled by him "Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian not admitted into the collections of their respective works," consists of 281 pages: of these only 54 are occupied with Dr. Parr's contributions, consisting of the Preface of the Editor to Warburton's two Tracts, the Dedication of two Tracts of a Warburtonian, and the Preface of the Editor to two Tracts of a Warburtonian. Some account of this republication has been given in the Biographical Memoir prefixed to this Edition. The Dedication and the Prefaces are now only inserted; neither Dr. Parr's fame, nor his pen, being concerned with the rest.

PREFACE OF THE EDITOR

TO

WARBURTON'S TWO TRACTS.

For reasons which it is by no means difficult to conjecture, though it might be invidious to state them, the Bp. of Worcester has not deigned to give a place to the two following Tracts in his late magnificent Edition of Warburton's Works. By republishing them, however, without the permission of the R. R. Editor, I mean not to arraign his taste or his prudence. I am disposed even to bestow some commendation upon the delicacy of his friendship, in endeavouring to suppress two juvenile performances, which the Author, from unnecessary caution or ill-directed pride, would probably have wished to be forgotten. But among readers of candour and discernment, the character of Bp. Warburton cannot suffer any diminution of its lustre from this republication. They who are curious in collecting books, must certainly be anxious to possess all the writings of that eminent prelate. They who mark with philosophic precision the progress of the human understanding, will look up to Warburton with greater reverence and greater astonishment, when they compare the better productions of

his pen with the worse. The faults of the one are excused by the imperfections of his earlier education: but the excellencies of the other must be ascribed only to the unwearied activity, the unshackled boldness, the uncommon and almost unparalleled vigour of his native genius. The writer of the Divine Legation might, indeed with propriety, have bidden defiance to those puny and churlish critics who would measure his powers and his attainments by the incorrectness of his translations* and the un-

* It may be worth while to remind the reader, that one of Dr. Johnson's first literary efforts was an English Translation of a French Translation of a Book written originally in the Portuguese language. I never saw the work, but refer the reader to the character which is given of it by Sir John Hawkins, who found in it no traces of that robust and vigorous mind which distinguishes the later and better publications of the author of the Rambler. Some Editor less timid or less delicate than the R. R. Editor of Warburton's Works, has lately republished the Marmor Norfolciense of Johnson, though it had lost probably much of its original value in the mind of the author, though it is pronounced a dull work by his biographer, and though it was once thought even by the most impartial readers, seditious in its tendency. I know not whether Johnson left any directions with his executors about the M. N. nor whether Bp. Warburton laid any injunctions upon his R. R. Friend concerning the two books now republished. If the Bishop did impose any prohibition, the R. R. "Editor" has acted an honourable part in holding them back. But no obligation of this sort lies upon those to whom the Bishop's command were not communicated. I should add, that the M. N. had been "republished before" in 1775, during the life of Johnson, by some person who approved as little of his jacobite politics, as I do of the sentiments contained in the "anonymous Letters" which were written by some Warburtonian to "Jortin" and to "Leland."

couthness of his verses. He that explored the "wide* and trackless wastes of ancient times" with so much sagacity and so much success, ought to have laughed at every imputation of the weakness to which he was exposed from his credulity and singularity in the explanation of prodigies. Hæc et infinita alia ridebamus, et tamen Warburtonum inter præcipua Literarum et Patriæ ornamenta ponimus. Nam quod interdum ridenda dixit, non Warburtoni vitium, sed hominis est. Et nemo fuit quantumvis studiis magnus, cui non aliquando ridenda exciderint.—Vide Gronovium de Hadriano Junio in Centes. Usur. p. 35.

* See p. 32 of the Preface to vol. iii. of the Divine Legation.

DEDICATION

OF THE

TWO TRACTS OF A WARBURTONIAN,

ADDRESSED BY THE EDITOR TO A LEARNED CRITIC.

MY LORD,

In the fate of the two Tracts, which I have now the honour of dedicating to your Lordship, there are some circumstances peculiarly interesting to the curiosity of scholars, and to your own distinguished humanity. Like children * whom their parents were afraid or ashamed to acknowledge, they have long been condemned to wander about the world, unsheltered by the authority of a great name, and depending only upon the force of their own inherent merits either to attract the inquisitive, or to propitiate the censorious. Their titles, indeed, sometimes crept into the corner of a catalogue, and sometimes were caught skulking upon the shelf of a collector. Through want, however, of that eager

---

* Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς ἡδὺ ἐαυτῷ ἅπαν, μάλιστα δ' ἀντὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστος, τοῦτο πέπονθεν, ἀνάγκη πάντας φιλαύτους εἶναι· ἐπεὶ δὲ φίλαυτοι πάντες, καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν ἀνάγκη ἡδέα εἶναι πᾶσιν, οἷον ἔργα, λόγους, διὸ φιλοκύλακες ὡς ἐπιτοπολὺ καὶ φίλοτιμοι καὶ φιλότεκνοι. αὐτῶν γὰρ ἔργα τὰ τέκνα.—Vide Aristotelis Rhetoricam. lib. i. cap. 2.

and open support which authors generally give to their own works, the pamphlets themselves are now become extremely scarce, and that scarcity* has been shrewdly, or, if you please, my Lord, perversely imputed, not so much to the avidity of the purchasers as to the management of the writer. But whatever may have been the cause the fact is notorious, and therefore, in bringing them back to a tribunal from which they are supposed to shrink, I shall endeavour to rescue them from that oblivion which sometimes overtakes the best publications, even at the hazard of exposing them to that infamy which is never inflicted but on the worst.

The predilection which your Lordship is known to entertain for allegory induces me to resume the simile upon which I had glanced in the preceding paragraph. It were unnecessary, I am sure, to remind you, either that, from peculiarities in the features and dispositions of children, we often recognize their parent: or that, by the similitude to himself, whether it be of excellence or deformity,

* In the year 1765, when the Letter to Dr. Tho. Leland was become very scarce in England, it was republished in Ireland, and placed between Leland's Dissertation upon Eloquence and the Defence. The book is called, "Leland upon Eloquence," so that the Letter is not noticed in the title page. I should suppose that Leland republished the whole Dispute, to give the reasoning of his antagonist all the advantage of a more extensive circulation, and to prevent the renown of his wit from fading too soon. I had the honour of receiving four copies from Dr. Leland in the year 1777; but the book, I believe, has not often found its way to England, as I never saw any copies of it except my own.

which the one discovers in the other, he is sometimes inclined to cherish them with greater affection. If, then, your Lordship should should deign to employ your critical abilities upon the sophistry and the virulence, as well as upon the ingenuity and elegance, of these singular but anonymous compositions, you may have it in your power to add to the obligations which your stupendous discoveries have already conferred upon the learned world, by favouring it with some satisfactory conjecture about the person by whom they were written. The success which you can always command in the developement of complex beauties, and the detection of latent faults—the occasional and even involuntary exercise of congenial qualities, or congenial talents—the subversion of some established opinion, or the degradation of some elevated character—any, or all of these causes, my Lord, may entice the writer from the obscurity in which he has so long and so securely lurked—may act irresistibly upon his secret partialities and his secret aversions—may draw from him an ingenuous and direct confession, or, what is equally decisive, a faint and awkward denial. From your sagacity, therefore, as well as from your compassion, I now ask for that protection, which is said to have been hitherto refused by your prudence and your delicacy, to the deserted offspring of controversial zeal.

Of the reputation, my Lord, which you have so long, and they * say, so deservedly enjoyed, a large

* I have borrowed this qualifying phrase from the Letter-

part is to be ascribed to your insatiable love of novelty: and yet a larger, it may be, to your matchless dexterity in the defence of theories,* at once, fantastic and methodical—fantastic, I mean, without the brilliancy of invention, and methodical, without the solidity of logic. I am not, however, apprehensive of any contradiction, even from your Lordship, when I venture to pronounce these tracts to have been produced by the same understanding, to be marked by the same spirit, and to have been directed to the same end. That understanding, doubtless, was acute; that spirit professes at least, to be candid; and that end probably, according to your Lordship's estimation, was in the highest degree honourable. It was to deliver two illustrious, but whimsical hypotheses, from the impertinent and tyrannical intrusions of common sense. It was to unmask the hypocrisy, and to subdue the insolence, of two impotent sciolists, one of whom had presumed to commend your patron without adulation, and the other to confute him without asperity. It was to convince an undiscerning and in-

---

writer to Dr. Leland, and I do not suspect him of knowing that Dr. Bentley, in his Controversy upon Phalaris (vide pag. 66, edit. Lennep,) has shewn the strong affirmative power of the word λέγεται.

* "If we ask the reason, it would seem to be owing to that ambitious spirit of subtlety and refinement which, as Quintilian observes, puts men upon teaching not what they believe to be true, but what from the falsehood, or apparent strangeness of the matter, they expect the praise of ingenuity from being able to defend."—See Hurd's Note on the 410th line of Horace's Art of Poetry.

credulouous public, that Warburton was an infallible reasoner, Leland a superficial trifler, and Jortin, a most dastardly, a most insidious, and a most malignant calumniator.

Readers of illiterate and grovelling minds will, I am aware, startle at these strange and harsh positions. In an agony of amazement and indignation they will exclaim, like your Lordship and D'Orville,* en cor Zenodoti, en jecur Eratetis. But, by men of more enlarged and more exalted views—by men of a truly classical taste, who spurn aside the coarse beverage to be found in Greek Scholiasts, in order to revel on the luxurious dainties prepared by French Commentators—by men of truly philosophical penetration, who are ambitious to understand their Virgil from Warburton, and Horace from your Lordship—by all such enterprising critics, and all such fastidious hypercritics, the tribute of admiration will be cheerfully paid, both to the magnificence of the design and the felicity of the execution.

Now, my Lord, it is not quite forgotten by men of letters, nor, probably, by your Lordship, that, in the earlier stages of your literary and ecclesiastical career, you did not disdain to wield your pen, whether offensively or defensively, in favour of Bishop Warburton. While bigots were pouring forth their complaints, and witlings were levelling their pleasantry, against this formidable innovator:

* Vide D'Orville Animadversiones in Charit. p. 399, and Hurd's Note on line 97th of the Epistle to Augustus.

while answerers trembled, and readers stared: while dunces were lost in the mazes of his arguments, and scholars were confounded at the hardiness of his assertions: you, my Lord, stood forth with an avowed determination to share alike his danger and his disgrace. You affected to despise, even while you were endeavouring to repress, the clamours of the unenlightened herd, who saw, or pretended to see, absurdity in his criticisms, heterodoxy in his tenets, and brutality in his invectives. You made great paradoxes less incredible, by exciting our wonder at the greater, which were started by yourself. You taught us to set a just value upon the eccentricities of impetuous and untutored genius, by giving us an opportunity to compare them with the trickeries of cold and systematic refinement. You tempted us almost to forget and to forgive, whatever was offensive in noisy and boisterous reproaches, by turning aside our attention to the more grating sounds of quaint and sarcastic sneers.

Recollecting, therefore, the repeated displays of your ardour and your prowess, I cannot, my Lord, feel the smallest reluctance in calling upon you for new and more undisguised exertions in an old and a favourite cause. I think it even impossible for you to tarnish the well earned reputation, either of your abilities as a writer, or your virtues as a friend, by a deliberate and invincible indifference to the future celebrity of two works, which, like these, are intimately connected with the preservation of Dr. Warburton's true character, and, perhaps, of your own.

If suspending, for the present, our examination of the spirit which pervades your writings, we proceed to consider their pretensions as compositions, wide is the difference that appears between them, both in their excellencies * and in their faults.

He blundered against grammar, and you refined against idiom. He, from defect of taste, contaminated English by Gallicism, and you, from excess of affectation, sometimes disgraced what would have risen to ornamental and dignified writing, by a profuse mixture of vulgar or antiquated phraseology. He soared into sublimity without effort, and you by effort, sunk into a kind of familiarity, which without leading to perspicuity, borders upon meanness. He was great by the energies of nature, and you were little by the misapplication of art. He, to shew his strength, piled up huge and rugged masses of learning, and you to shew your skill, split and shivered them into what your brother critic calls *ψήγματα καὶ ἀραιώματα*. † He sometimes reached the force of Longinus, ‡ but without his elegance, and you exhibited the intricacies of Aristotle, but without his exactness.

---

* The words which Longinus uses in describing the character of Timæus, may, with a very little change, be applied to Warburton, *Ἀνὴρ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ ἱκανὸς, καὶ πρὸς λόγων ἐνίοτε μέγεθος οὐκ ἄφορος· πολυίστωρ, ἐπινοητικὸς, πλὴν ἀλλοτρίων μὲν ἐλεγκτικώτατος ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀνεπαισθητος δὲ ἰδίων· ὑπὸ δὲ ἔρωτος τοῦ ξένας νοήσεις ἀεὶ κινεῖν πολλάκις ἐκπίπτων εἰς τὸ παιδαριωδέστατον.* Longin. Sect. 4.

† Vide Longin. Sect. 10.

‡ When a celebrated Commentary upon Horace was first published, Malone, Reed, Farmer, Tyrwhitt, Steevens, the two

he language of Warburton is, I believe, gene-
allowed to be abrupt, inartificial, and undisci-
d; irregular as the mind of the writer, and
d with many diversified hues, from the rapid
uncertain course of his extensive and miscella-
s reading. As to your Lordship, whatever
ess some prying and morose observers may

---

ns, Burke, and, in his critical capacity, Dr. Johnson, had
me forward as the guides of the public taste. This is
ort of plea for setting Warburton at the head of English
. I cannot so readily account for the superiority as-
him over Longinus and Aristotle, unless the Commenta-
read their works, as Warburton was now and then sus-
of reading them, in a French translation. Our critic
"that it was not every wood, that will make a mercury,"
t he compliments Warburton, "as if nobody would dis-
he fitness of that, which was growing so near the altar."
te on line 15 of the epistle to Augustus.

Commentator, it seems, was offended with Lipsius for
ting an Archbishop of Mecklin, with Pagan complaisance,
e order of Deities." I wish to know, whether, if he had
the dedication to Horace in Latin, he would have found
istent with his own Christian complaisance, to have called
rton a Deus in criticism, just as Scævola calls Crassus in
o Deum, and as Catullus calls Antonius in dispositione
entorum Deum (vid. Lib. 1 and 2 de Orat.), and as Cicero,
ressing the Senate after his return from exile, says of
us, that he was the parens et Deus nostræ vitæ, fortunæ,
iæ, nominis, &c. I am far from wishing to apologize for
cking adulation of Lipsius, or to recommend the above-
ned use of Deus to a modern writer of Latin. But,
ect that no man, who understands the Latin language,
d more of the spirit of flattery in the word Deus restrain-
limited by its subject, than in the pompous pageantry
e spread by the Commentator over the Rev. Mr. War-
, when the latter was advancing fast towards a Bishoprick.

have traced between you and Virtumnus in the versatility of your principles, the comparison must not be extended to the features of your style, concerning which, if we should grant the mille ornatus to belong to it, we cannot add, without the grossest hypocrisy, or the most vitiated taste, mille decenter habet. Let me, however, commend both you and the Bishop of Gloucester, where commendation is due: and let me bestow it, not with the thrifty and penurious measure of a critic by profession, nor yet, with the coldness and languour of an envious antagonist, but, with the ardent gratitude of a man, whom, after many a painful feeling of weariness and disgust, you have refreshed unexpectedly, and whom, as if by some secret touch of magic, you have charmed and overpowered with the most exquisite sense of delight. Yes, my Lord, in a few lucky and lucid intervals between the paroxysms of your polemical frenzy, all the laughable and all the loathsome singularities which floated upon the surface of your diction, have in a moment vanished, while in their stead, beauties equally striking from their suddenness, their originality, and their splendour, have burst in a "flood of glory" upon the astonished and enraptured reader. Often has my mind hung with fondness and with admiration over the crowded, yet clear and luminous galaxies of imagery diffused through the works of Bishop Taylor, the mild and unsullied lustre of Addison, the variegated and expanded eloquence of Burke, the exuberance and dignified ease of Middleton, the gorgeous declamation of Bolingbroke, and the ma-

jestic energy of Johnson. But if I were to do justice, my Lord, to the more excellent parts of your own writings and of Warburton's I should say that the English language, even in its widest extent, cannot furnish passages more strongly marked, either by grandeur in the thought, by felicity * in the expression, by pauses varied and harmonious, or by full and sonorous periods.

I must beg your Lordship's pardon for a little seeming irregularity in the order of my remarks. To separate the character of your speculative writings, whether in criticism or theology, from the merits of those which are more purely and professedly controversial, is no easy task. Warburton, in his rapid marches and counter-marches from profane learning to sacred, and from sacred to profane, always found or created opportunities, for skirmishing with some rival novelty, or combating with gladiatorial fierceness some inveterate, and therefore obnoxious opinion.† In many, also, of the publica-

* See the character of Bayle, sect. 4th, b. 1st of the D. L. description of the inspectors general over clerical faith, p. 26, vol. 3d. The different characters of eloquence pp. 53 and 54 in the doctrine of Grace, and, above all, the representation of the Christian Church in the introduction to Julian, edit. 1751.

Instead of referring particularly to beautiful passages in Warburton's Friend, I shall only say, that some may be gleaned, here and there, even in his critical writings, that many are to be found in those which treat of politics, and more, when he ascends to subjects of morality and religion.

† The Bishop would have said prejudice. The authorities of Fletcher and Bacon protect the word inveterate from the charge of Latinism.

tions ascribed to your Lordship, as well as in those of your patron, it may be observed, that you seldom dispute without an itch for criticism, and seldom criticise without a rage for dispute. Pardon me, however, if, summoning the whole force of my mind, I thus balance you and the Bp. of G. as your admirers, if they had dipped into Persius, would exclaim, In rasis antithetis.

To grapple with the unweildy was among the frolics of Warburton, whilst your Lordship toiled in chasing the subtle. He often darkened the subject, and you perplexed it. He, by the boldness and magnitude of his conceptions, overwhelmed our minds with astonishment, and you, by the singularity and nicety of your quibbles, benumbed them with surprize. In him we find our intellectual powers expanded and invigorated by the full and vivid representation which he sometimes holds up, both of common and uncommon objects, while you, my Lord, contrive to cramp and to cripple them by all the tedious formalities of minute and scrupulous analysis. He scorned every appearance of soothing the reader into attention, and you failed in almost every attempt to decoy him into conviction. He instructed, even where he did not persuade, and you, by your petulant and contemptuous gibes, disgusted every man of sense, whom you might otherwise have amused by your curious and shewy conceits.

Conversant as I may be in the most celebrated writings of the Warburtonian Sect, I confess myself unable to expatiate after your Lordship's man-

ner upon their romantic freaks of affectation or spleen in the choice of their subjects—upon the stately array or the grotesque machinery of their arguments—upon the wanton coruscations of their metaphors, and the "baseless fabrics of their visions" in the allegories and double senses—upon the rambling digressions into which we are diverted, and the intricate labyrinths in which we are bewildered by their notes—upon the luxuriant and vicious, as well as upon the more chaste and more happy embellishments of their style. I leave, therefore, this land of phantoms and wonders to be explored by some dainty commentator who, like Launcelot,* "hath planted in his memory an army of good words," and who, like your Lordship, "would for a tricksy phrase defy the matter." Let me, however, drop a few remarks upon those unsparing and undistinguishing sallies of ridicule which have been employed sometimes to adorn and sometimes to enforce both the "light† and the solid whimsies," both the critical chimeras, and the theological dogmas of the Warburtonian School.

Wit was in Warburton the spontaneous growth of nature, while in your Lordship it seemed to be the forced and unmellowed fruit of study. He, in these lighter exertions still preserved his vigour, as you, in your greater, seldom laid aside your flippancy. He, perhaps with better success than Demosthenes,

---

* See Merchant of Venice. † See Prior's Alma, Book ii.

seized the famam Dicacis, and you, with success not quite equal, aimed at the praise of urbanity.* He flamed upon his readers with the brilliancy of a meteor, and you scattered around them the scintillations † of a firebrand.

But in the treatment of your respective, or, I should rather say, your common antagonists, the similarity of your prejudices was a little obscured by the inequality of your talents.

Some of the disputants whom Warburton would have scared with ferocious defiance, you, my Lord, condescended only to insult with cool derision. Others, whom he would have crushed by dogmatical contradiction, you were content to tease by captious misrepresentation. He, from his towering and distant heights rushed down upon his prey, and disdaining the ostentatious prodigalities of cruelty, destroyed it at a blow. But you, my Lord, contracting, as it were, and distorting the nobler shape which Nature had really bestowed upon you, took, what to some may appear a perverse and abject pleasure, in crawling upon the earth. Yet, in

---

* Vide Quintil. lib. vi. cap. 3.

† Having risqued two metaphors in this paragraph, I was prevented by my fear of his Lordship's critical artillery from borrowing a third to insert in the text. But I am ready to give up either or both of them to my readers, if, adopting the much stronger phraseology of a much greater writer than I am, they will say, that "in his Lordship we are provoked at the venom of the shaft, but in Warburton are terrified at the strength of the bow."—See Johnson's Character of Junius in his Political Tracts.

this very choice of situation, artifice was blended with whim: for you entered upon it as a sort of vantage-ground well adapted to your purpose, that you might spring upon an enemy more suddenly, and pierce him more surely: that you might protract or shorten his torments at your own capricious will: that you might sharpen them to try the sensibility of the sufferer, or allay them when your justice, shall I say, or your anger was satiated.

And here, my Lord, instead of pushing any farther the contrast between you in points where you appear unlike or unequal, I shall for a moment look back to some particulars in which the resemblance between you was most conspicuous. Those particulars are to be found in your eager propensity to start aside from the regular and common orbit of opinion upon every plain, every abstruse, every trifling, and every important subject—in your arbitrary and abrupt deviations from the established and common forms of language—in your unbounded admiration of each other, and in your unrelenting scorn of every contemporary writer, by whom you seemed to be less admired than you were by yourselves. Surely my opinion does not clash with any critical canons promulgated by your Lordship, when I call such resemblance a clear and unequivocal proof of imitation.

The claims of Warburton to originality, in some of his remarks upon the philosophers of antiquity, some of his emendations upon our great tragedian, and some of his boasted discoveries in the science of

theology,* have, as your Lordship knows, not been indiscriminately and implicitly admitted. I appeal to your candour, my Lord, and if that should fail me to your recollection, for the accuracy of my assertion when I add, that several of those claims have not only been disputed by the malignant officiousness of envy, but invalidated and sometimes overthrown by the rigours of impartial criticism. For my part, however, I am disposed to pardon

* The Letter-writer to Leland says, that "the unpopular cry against Warburton is in this country silenced, that men of sense and judgment now consider his paradoxes as very harmless, nay, as very sober and certain truths, and even vie with each other in building upon them the most just and rational vindication of our religion." This he represents "as the present state of things with us, and especially, they say, in the two Universities of this kingdom." Now I resided in one of the Universities soon after the time at which this Letter was published: I have since visited many learned and inquisitive friends in the Sister University: I have had the honour of conversing pretty much at large with men of Letters in the world: I have often been present when the paradoxes of Warburton were discussed in conversation, and yet I never heard the slightest whisper about that complete revolution in public opinion, which our Letter-writer so peremptorily asserts and so triumphantly describes. After all, men of candour will only smile at these honesta misericordia mendacia, when employed to prop up a tottering cause; and perhaps men of refinement may consider them as "a true rhetorical payment," very fit to be accepted by a Dublin professor of oratory. Our Letter-writer "was called upon for his reckoning, and he discharged it," not with argument or fact, but with rhetorical hyperbole. What was the consequence? "He who had not spared the Bishop, demolished" the Letter-writer.—See D. L. vol. v, p. 420.

and even to applaud the ruffian plunders of an adventurer,* who from the stores of his own capacious and active mind was able to enrich and dignify his spoils—to mould them into various and striking forms—to deck them with new and becoming ornaments, and apply them to purposes at once the most unexpected and the most splendid. But, upon the petty larcenies of his "servile† imitators," upon the plagiarisms‡ of those who pilfered be-

---

* I have adopted this expression from Bishop Hallifax, who, in the same passage, styles Warburton "the most illustrious author of the age." What Bishop Hallifax really is in the republic of learning, it can be no disgrace for any other scholar to be, and therefore I shall without hesitation apply "to the most illustrious author of the age," the name of an "Adventurer." Bishop Warburton, in the Dedication of the third vol. of the Divine Legation, represents himself as "seized with that epidemic malady of the idle visionary men," "the projecting to instruct and inform the public."—See preface to the last edition of three sermons published at Cambridge, by Dr. Hallifax, and the Dedication of vol. 3 of the Divine Legation.

† See Remarks on Hume's Essay, p. 13.

‡ My meaning will be explained by the following quotation, which I give at length, as the book from which it is taken has become scarce:

'While the Bishop is puffing and celebrating himself with grace or modesty for this wonderful atchievement on Virgil; which he has accomplished with the aid of Meursius, he vouchsafes to drop some little dew of praise on a certain Zany of his; and draws that little from Mr. Addison, on whose ruin this puny (I mean able) critic's glory is to be reared; as the said Zany had reared the great Mountebank's on having totally eclipsed Aristotle and Longinus. "It was not thus (says Quintus Flestrin; that is, not as Mr. Addison has done;) that an able critic lately explained Virgil's noble allegory in the begin-

cause they could not invent, and disguised because they could not improve; upon poverty screened by ostentation and arrogance leagued with fraud, every intelligent reader must look down with emotions of just and poignant contempt.

There is one advantageous point of view, my Lord, in which some distinguishing characteristics of Warburton press themselves upon my notice, and in respect to which I must leave some able writer to draw the parallel between you and your supposed archetype, so far as such a parallel may be consistent with decorum and with truth.

The Bishop of Gloucester, amidst all his fooleries in criticism and all his outrages in controversy, certainly united a most vigorous and comprehensive intellect with an open and a generous heart. As a a friend, he was, what your Lordship experienced, zealous and constant: and as an enemy, he pro-

---

ning of the Third Georgic," &c. 'It was not, indeed; for Mr. Addison looked into himself and his own ideas only; the able critic (forgetting Persius's rule, ne te quæsiveris extra) looked into F. Catrou, in whom he found all that his master so applauds and exalts, only not quite so fine-drawn and wire-drawn. Pox take those rascals who lived before us, said a pleasant fellow: they have stolen and run away with all the good things I should have said. 'Tis all the Meursius's and Catrou's are good for. When the late D. of R. kept wild beasts, it was a common diversion to make two of the bears drunk, (not metaphorically with flattery, but literally with strong ale,) and then daub them over with honey. It was excellent sport to see how lovingly (like a couple of critics) they would lick and claw one another.'—See Confusion worse confounded, page 74.

ly describes himself to have been choleric,* but t implacable. He, my Lord, threw a cloud over man's brighter prospects of prosperity or honour dark and portentous whispers in the ears of the werful. He, in private company, blasted no n's good name by shedding over it the cold and idly mildews of insinuation. He was too mag- nimous to undermine when his duty or his ho- ur prompted him to overthrow. He was too cere to disguise the natural haughtiness and irri- ility of his temper under a specious veil of hu- lity and meekness. He never thought it expe- nt to save appearances by shaking off the hackles of consistency"†—to soften the hideous ect of certain uncourtly opinions ‡ by a calm and gressive apostacy—to expiate the artless and mated effusions of his youth, by the example a temporizing and obsequious old age. He be- n not his course, as others have done, with culative republicanism, nor did he end it, as the ne persons are now doing, with practical toryism. was a churchman without bigotry—he was a

---

See the conclusion of Dr. Warburton's Letter to Dr. Lowth, d Winchester, Sept. 17, 1756.

See page 100 of the Remarks on Hume.

I am told by one, whom I esteem the best Greek scholar in kingdom, and to whom the hat of Bentley would have ailed," that many notable discoveries might be made by paring the variæ lectiones, the clippings and the filings, the enings and the varnishings of sundry constitutional doc- es as they crept by little and little into the different suc- ive editions of certain political dialogues.

politician without duplicity—he was a loyalist without servility.

Such, my Lord, on the brighter side of his character, was the champion under whose banners you enlisted; and if, in the eager pursuit of glory, you, sometimes, appeared to swerve a little from the precepts of a benevolent religion; if you trampled, inadvertently no doubt, upon the established decorums of civilized life; nay, if you rushed somewhat beyond the licensed violences of critical and theological war, yet, my Lord, it is in the power of observers, dispassionate and impartial as I am, to urge in your behalf some pleas, the truth of which will not hastily be disputed.

The distinguishing virtues even of the best men, may, for a time, be eclipsed by particular situation. While, therefore, we allow your Lordship all the praise which is due to habitual discretion and constitutional gentleness, we are by no means surprised, that, in the service of such a leader, you were now and then hurried into rashness, sharpened into acrimony, or betrayed into illiberality. We rather lament, that the better propensities of your mind were suspended, and indeed overborne, by the fascination of Warburton's example, the sternness of his commands, and, with all due reverence let me add, the tremendous severity of his threats. We mourn over the common infirmities of human nature itself, when we recollect that, with a temper which effectually preserved you from the tumultuous fervours of enthusiasm, and with talents which might have procured you success in the regular and ordinary course

of controversial hostilities, you were disposed, or, I would rather say, destined to become the herald of the sturdiest knight errant that ever sallied out in quest of literary crusades. To become the apologist, nay, the avenger of a staunch polemic, who attacked with blind and headstrong fury the most unexplored fastnesses of impiety and the most venerable citadels of truth—to become the drudge of an imperious task maker, who finding himself accompanied by a train of feeble and officious dwarfs, summoned them by his fierce mandates to plunge with him into every difficulty—to triumph with him in every victory, to make a display of their fidelity or their zeal in every wild and desperate atchievement, which he was himself emboldened to undertake, by the consciousness of his own gigantic strength. "The staff of his spear was like a weaver's beam, and one bearing a shield" always "went before him." From this paragraph, my Lord, you may perceive that, however fearful I may be of offending you by coarse and extravagant flattery, yet I can, upon a proper occasion, step forth to shelter you from excessive and undistinguishing reproach; that I can palliate the failings which it were shameless to deny, and that I can at least explain those peculiarities, which, in terms of direct and unqualified approbation, it might stagger even your Lordship's resolution to defend.

The success, indeed, with which I have just now assumed the language of an advocate, induces me to venture upon the more arduous, but more pleasing task of an encomiast. With your Lordship's per-

mission then, I will contrast the sullen obstinacy, or, if you please, the delicate reserve of our letter-writer with the frankness and magnanimity of the Bishop of Litchfield.

This prelate, it seems, had formerly published some anonymous Remarks upon Mr. David Hume's Natural History of Religion. Our letter-writer, also, professes to "have his reasons for addressing Dr. Leland in a public manner," without informing him explicitly,* who he was. Thus far then each of these combatants acted with prudence, in beginning their "deeds without a name." But in the sequel of their history we shall have reason to consider the one as a hero, and the other as a coward.

Hume, in some materials that he had prepared for the History of his own Life, ventured to speak peevishly and slightingly of the above-mentioned Remarks, as breathing, forsooth! the spirit of the Warburtonian school,† and as written by Dr. Hurd.

---

* Whatever the practice of the Warburtonians may be, Warburton gave this account of himself: "I am a plain man; and on my first appearance in this way I told my name, and who I belonged to."—Preface to the Defence of the Divine Legation.

† Among the numerous peculiarities of the Warburtonian school, none are more striking or more offensive than the extravagant applause which the disciples bestow upon their great master. I have now and then met with sober-minded and impartial critics, by whom the Bishop of L. himself is thought not quite exempt from the sin of flattery, especially in his Dedication to the second Volume of Horace, where he represents criticism as advanced, under the auspices of Warburton, to that "full share of glory," which it had not reached by the

What was the consequence? why, the Dr. (now Bishop of L. and C.) graciously permitted his bookseller to republish those Remarks, boldly ac-

---

labours of a Longinus and an Aristotle. Now to soften a little the impression which such violent language may make upon the mind of the reader, I would refer him to the Introduction to the Remarks on David Hume, where, (as in page 9 and 10,) the writer arrogates to himself the merit of "judging more freely and more severely of Warburton than perhaps his enemies themselves," declares himself the "last man in the world who, out of a fondness for Warburton's notions would neglect or betray any useful truth;" and, in short, represents himself as "one who weighs his arguments without considering his authority, or even the disgrace he might be thought to incur from the confutation of them." After perusing the ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth pages, the reader, if he has taste enough to be a commentator, will be charmed at the address of this complimentary Introduction, and, if he happens to be a scholar, he may be tempted to apply to a certain modern character, what "experience, reaching to something like prophetic strain," suggested to the mind of two antient writers:

"Ὁ δὲ πάντων ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ πανουργότατον, αἰσθανόμενος τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ λεγομένην καὶ δοκοῦσαν ἰδίαν εἶναι φωνὴν ὡς περί τινος ζώου τῆς φιλίας, τὸ δὲ ἀπαῤῥησίαστον, ἀφιλὸν καὶ ἀγενὲς, οὐδὲ ταυτὴν ἀμίμητον ἀπολέλοιπεν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ οἱ δεινοὶ τῶν ὀψοποιῶν τοῖς πικροῖς χυμοῖς καὶ αὐστηροῖς ἡδύσμασι χρῶνται, τῶν γλυκέων ἀφαιροῦντες τὸ πλήσιμον, οὕτως, οἱ κόλακες, οὐκ ἀληθινὴν οὐδ' ὠφέλιμον, ἀλλ' οἷον ἐπιλλώπτουσαν ἐξ ὀφρύος καὶ γαργαλίζουσαν ἀτεχνῶς παῤῥησίαν προσφέρουσιν.—Plutarch, de Adul. et Amic. Discrim. p. 51. edit. Xyland.

"Aperte adulantem nemo non videt, nisi qui admodum est excors. Callidus ille et occultus ne se insinuet, studiose cavendum est: nec enim facillime agnoscitur, quippe qui etiam adversando sæpe assentetur; et litigare se simulans blandiatur atque ad extremum det manus, vincique se patiatur, ut is qui illusus sit, plus vidisse videatur."—Cicero, de Amicitia, par. 26.

knowledged the justness of Hume's conjectures as to the writer, and wisely reserved the privilege of "explaining himself,* if he should think it worth his while, more particularly on the subject."

In a note† replete with vivacity and erudition, Jortin chastised the impertinence of the anonymous Letter-writer on the delicacy of friendship. Leland, also, in a tone of manly indignation, laid bare the cavils, and baffled the invectives of the same pert and spiteful pamphleteer, after he had pretended to "reduce the rhetorick of his antagonist to reason, and to pick up the loose ends of his arguments as he found them any where come up in the chapters of his book." But the efforts of these injured men, to do themselves justice were not followed by the same effects which Mr. Hume's Complaint had produced on the nobler mind of his answerer. The zeal of Dr. Hurd had not cooled by time; his fidelity was not diminished by change of station; his courage was yet unshaken and worthy of his cause. For, upon the first tidings of the obnoxious sentence in Mr. Hume's Life, he despised it as a calumny; he braved it as a challenge; and then he, without hesitation dropped his mask; he threw aside the ἄσημα ὅπλα‡ which he had before carried into the field, and

* See Mr. Cadell's Preface.

† This note is printed among the Testimonia Auctorum, and exemplifies the justness of Quintilian's observation: "Acutior est ille atque velocior in urbanitate brevitas, cujus quidem duplex est forma dicendi ac respondendi. Sed ratio communis in parte; nihil enim in lacessendo dici potest, quod non etiam in repercutiendo."—Vide Quintil. de Risu, lib. vi. cap. 3.

‡ Vide Eurip. Phœniss. vers. 1129.

ckling on his trustiest armour, he renewed the ttle.

Ζεὺς πατὴρ ἐπ' ἀσπίδος
Σταδαῖος ἦσται διὰ χερὸς βέλος φλέγων.*

Our Letter-writer,† on the contrary, seems to have en intimidated at the first approach of the foes, hom he had wantonly provoked. He retreated om the contest with a caution not less inglorious an the precipitation with which he had engaged in —he did not condescend to republish his railings -he did not attempt to vindicate his misrepre-ntations—he did not dare to discover his name. Vhen Leland opposed him with arguments, and ortin harassed him with wit, he had neither the pirit to reply, nor the honesty to retract.

Now, my Lord, it seems to me a task of no great ifficulty to explain this difference of conduct, in ie Prelate and the Letter-writer. David Hume we re told, and upon the authority of one, whose pro-uctions are notoriously exempt from the same harges, David Hume, was a "captious, versatile,

* Vide Æschyl. Sep. Con. Theb. vers. 518.

† I have assumed that the Letter to Dr. Leland, and the issertation on the Delicacy of Friendship, were the coinage f the same mint, for they bear the same impression of petu-nce and cavil. As the Dissertation is addressed to Dr. Jor-n in an epistolary form, I call the author of it the "Letter-riter." But the reader is desired not to be precipitate in onfounding this anonymous Letter-writer with the Remarker n Mr. Hume, whose name is known. I have myself so dis-nguished them as to give no encouragement to the invidious rmise, that the Letters and the Remarks were not written y different persons.

and evasive writer.* He was a puny dialectician from the North, who came to the attack with a beggarly troop of routed sophisms. He was the philosophic head of a philosophic gang, who dealt in mere pedlars † wares of matter and motion." He, it should seem, was not worthy of "elaborate animadversions adapted to the instruction or entertainment of learned readers," though his answerer, doubtless, was capable of writing such animadversions, whensoever the dignity of the subject, or the talents of his adversary, should require it. But an hour, even a "vacant hour" when employed by Dr. Richard Hurd "was fully sufficient to expose to the laughter of every man that could read, the futility, licence, and vanity of Mr. David Hume." All this had been said once, and therefore might be said again with equal effect. It was said justly the first time, for David Hume was an infidel; and it was said most properly a second time, for Dr. Hurd was now a Bi-

* The reader will find these choice expressions in the seventh, the eleventh, and the fourteenth and twenty-first pages of the Remarks on Hume's Essay. Indeed, "the whole thing is full of curiosities."—Page 15.

† "Ask the critic in what cases tropical and figurative expressions are faults in composition. He answers, when they are gross and indelicate, puerile or frigid; or when they are disproportioned and utterly unsuitable to the subject. He tells you, for instance, that if Demosthenes really used such metaphors as those which his adversary objects to him, "the state is packed up and matted," they "thread us like needles," &c. he justly incurs the censure of adopting gross and illiberal similitudes, on an occasion which required decency and gravity."—Cap. v. p. 31. edit. quart. Leland on the Principles of Human Eloquence.

shop. But our Letter-writer "had to do"* (as Warburton says) with antagonists of a different class. The biographer of Philip of Macedon, and the author of Remarks upon Ecclesiastical History, had a right to expect from their clerical opponent a milder and more respectful treatment † than that which the Bishop of L. had given to a sceptic, who scoffed at all the principles of religion and who had endeavoured to loosen the strongest obligations of morality. Even the atrocious guilt of dissenting from Bishop Warburton had not entirely effaced the remembrance of their attainments as scholars, or of their virtues as Christians. By the general suffrage of the public, and, I suspect, my Lord, in the secret estimation of the Letter-writer, these two excellent men were not to be annoyed again and again by the poisonous arrows of slander, and bereaved of the sacred rights of reputation with perpetual impunity to an unseen, unblushing, unfeeling accuser.

To the Remarker, ‡ who eloquently talks of borrowing his sword from Warburton, because Warburton had "borrowed it from the sanctuary,"§ I

* See Preface to the Divine Legation, published 1740.

† If the Letter-writer be as well versed in Quintilian as the Commentators upon Horace is supposed to be, he might remember, though late, this instructive passage: "Quidam sunt ita receptæ auctoritatis et notæ verecundiæ, ut nocitura sit in eos dicendi petulantia."—Quintilian, lib. vi. cap. 3.

‡ I am not quite satisfied with this word, though Johnson, in his Dictionary, affixes to it the authority of Watts. I use it from necessity, or, at least, for the sake of avoiding the tiresome periphrasis of saying, "the writer of the Remarks."

§ Page 7, of the Remarks on Hume.

would not uncharitably impute any lurking bias towards the base and perilous maxim, that "means are sanctified by ends." But, if the venial prejudices of the public present him with advantages of another kind, why should he not avail himself of them? The glare of an author's situation is apt to dazzle common readers, and to hide from their view the deformities of his writings. When the "discordant din and clamour of ignorance and prepossession have been raised against a writer, they prepare the way for the divine and consentient harmony of praise,"* in favour of every assailant who supplies the want of strength by agility or venom. Amidst these, or similar circumstances, a skilful disputant will find it easy to exercise his craftiness, and even to glut his ill-nature, without appearing, in the eyes of superficial observers, to sacrifice his impartiality or his candour. And if the cause which he defends should happen to be just as well as popular, he need not be very scrupulous about the manner of defending it. Thus, my Lord, the foulest scurrilities,† when hurled by the hand of a

* See Hurd's note on line 63, of the Epistle to Augustus.

† Let me assure the reader, that I have examined Mr. Hume's Essays with too much attention, either to be seduced by their fallacious reasonings, or to be indifferent about their destructive consequences to the sacred interests of morality and religion. But, while I enter this sincere and solemn protest against the philosophical tenets of a most able, but most dangerous writer, I cannot indiscriminately approve of the temper in which our Remarker had been pleased to "maintain the most awful truths, and exemplify the impression made upon the writer's own heart."—Vide page 12 of the Remarks.

Bishop against a reputed Atheist, would be received by the loudest bursts of applause. But, surely, the loudest storms of public odium would beat around the head of the satyrical sophist, if he should, a second time venture to let loose his petulance and his virulence against two characters less injurious than the Atheist to the interests of society, and less offensive to the feelings of the wise and good. In vain would the offender exclaim, that he was "only in sport"—that he had "put forth only half his might"—that he meant only to pelt his adversaries with trim urbanity, with oblique insinuation, and

---

I do not justify, in all instances, the real or affected moderation of those who would "combat flagitious tenets with serenity." But I have my doubts how far, upon such momentous and awful topics, the multæ et cum gravitate facetiæ can be employed with propriety, and those doubts are certainly not at all removed by the experiment of the Right Reverend Remarker upon Mr. Hume's Essay. The religionist, as well as the orator, ne dicet quidem false, quoties poterit, et dictum potius aliquando perdet, quam minuet auctoritatem. Vitabit ne petulans, ne superbum, ne loco, ne tempori alienum videatur."—Vide Quintilian, lib. vi. cap. 3. But, to pass over from the Remarker to our Letter-writer, the latter, I believe, will not give me a place in his catalogue of "soft divines and courtly controversialists." Instead, however, of retorting the compliment, I shall "take leave" to quote in my behalf the answer of a Spartan, which Plutarch has recorded, and which the Right Reverend Remarker, if he had stumbled upon it, might have deigned, perhaps, to place in the front of his strictures upon Hume's Essay: *ἐπαινομένου χαρίλλου τοῦ βασιλέως, πῶς οὗτος, ἔφη, χρηστὸς ὁς οὐδὲ τοῖς πονηροῖς πικρὸς ἐστί.*"—Plutarch de Adulat. et Amic. Discrim. p. 55. In a moral treatise, De Virtutibus et Vitiis, asscribed, I believe erroneously, to Aristotle, *μισοπονηρία* is considered as a part of justice.

all the lighter missive weapons of the controversial armoury.

While, therefore, we commend the modesty of Bishop Hurd, when, by the mouth of his bookseller, he "declares * himself sorry, that he could not take upon himself the whole infamy of the charge brought against him by Mr. Hume," we are at no loss to account for the caution of the Letter-writer, when he forbears to plead guilty by his own mouth to the weightier charges, which had been alledged against him by a Leland and a Jortin. And, in truth, my Lord, the charge of having calumniated such men in such a manner, is so very formidable, that, even among the bigotted admirers of Warburton, not more than one can be found with sufficient effrontery to defy the whole infamy, or sufficient ingenuousness to confess, that he deserved only a part.

Your Lordship will anticipate me in observing such particulars as belong in common to the Essay and the Letters of which I have been speaking. They had equally the merit of being written in professed defence of Warburton's "Notions," or in professed imitation of his style.† They had equally

* See Mr. Cadell's Address to the Reader.

† I take this upon the authority of the Remarker, who says it of himself. As to the style of the Letter-writer, where it is formed upon no models, either good or bad, the particularities of it may, in many instances, be thus accounted for: "When a writer determines at any rate to be original, nothing can be expected but an awkward straining in everything. Improper method, forced conceits and affected expression are the certain

the honour of being censured by the persons against whom they were severally pointed. They had equally the misfortune to be at first condemned and afterwards forgotten by the public. The chief, though not the only point, in which they differ is, that the Essay has, and the Letters have not, been avowed and republished by their respective authors. This defect, however, on the part of the Letters, I shall myself, in some degree, supply, by undertaking voluntarily the office of republication; and I, at the same time, shall leave the author to complete, as far as he can, the similitude between the Bishop of Litchfield and himself, by making, "when he shall think fit," an avowal of his name. Should such an event, indeed, ever happen, the example of the Bishop in declaring his name may be productive of more advantages than were originally intended, or, as I suspect, even desired by the Right Reverend Prelate himself. The immediate, and, doubtless, the most important consequence of that declaration, was to procure the full measure of fame to a learned theologue, who had "earthed Mr Hume in the obscure "regions of philosophy where he lay rolled up in the scoria of dogmatist and sceptic, run down together."* Its secondary, but not inconsiderable

issue of such obstinacy. The business is to be unlike; and this he may very possibly be, but at the expence of graceful ease and true beauty. For he puts himself at best into a convulsed, unnatural state; and it is well if he be not forced beside his purpose, to leave common sense, as well as his model, behind him."—See the Discourse on Poetical Imitation, sec. 2.

* See Remarks on Hume's Essay, p. 99.

praise, will be, to bring down upon our sophistical Letter-writer all that open and all that heavy disgrace, which he has long deserved to suffer for his most unprovoked and unfounded invectives against two illustrious ornaments of learning and religion. To a compensation of some kind or other they are certainly entitled; and your Lordship, I trust, will concur with me in thinking, that the republication of the books written against them will more effectually answer this honourable and necessary purpose than a direct argumentative defence, which, as the subjects are not exhausted in Jortin's Note or Leland's Pamphlet, I once intended to prepare for the press. It will shew by the brightest proofs, that Leland and Jortin scarcely need any elaborate justification; and that their antagonist, however plausible in his objections, or smart in his raillery, cannot, without the greatest difficulty, be justified by himself or his admirers.

I will not apologize to your Lordship for this seeming digression. It may recall to your memory the rapidity with which some readers will carry on their conclusions from specific to personal identity; and it may also exercise your sagacity, in tracing all the finer ties by which the contrast between the Bishop of L. and the Letter-writer is connected with the general and more obvious purpose of this Dedication.

Pardon me, however, my Lord, if, as I advance towards the close, "I get on that seducing subject, the importance which every writer is of to himself, and which makes me imagine that perhaps you

may be tempted to push your enquiries concerning me somewhat farther."*

Your critical writings, my Lord, have by few scholars been more frequently read, or more carefully studied, than by myself. I have "paced it"† like Homer's mules,‡ with many a weary step, through the heights and the depths;§ the obliquities and the asperities; the archaisms and the modernisms; the strained analogies and the crooked anomalies; the rhetorical flourishes and the logical quaintnesses; the colloquial familiarities, and the oracular solemnities, of your most elaborate and peerless style. To snatch so many varied graces was not beyond the reach of your Lordship's art. But I had learned from the highest authority, that "the more generally the best models are understood, the greater danger there is of running into that worst of literary faults, affectation."‖ This, my Lord, is one of the reasons which deterred me from every presumptuous attempt to imitate your diction: another was, the conscious disparity of my intellectual powers: and a third, not less efficacious than the rest, I shall, with the most painful reluctance, now reveal. Let my sincerity atone for my

---

* Page 8, of the Remarks on Hume.

† See Letter to Leland.

‡ Πολλὰ δ' ἄνανται, κάταντα, πάραντά τε δόχμια τ' ἦλθον.—Iliad 23.

§ These are the general characters of his Lordship's style. But of the particular exceptions I have before spoken, in terms not merely of praise but of admiration.

‖ See Hurd's note on line 404 of Horace's Art of Poetry.

insensibility, when I confess to you that, often as I have read, and much as I may admire your learned researches, I seldom felt myself glow with that enthusiastic fondness for my original, which is indispensably necessary to successful imitation. Despairing therefore, of my ability to accommodate the manner of this address to your Lordship's refined taste, I console myself with reflecting, that, in the matter of it there is little which can give offence to your tenderest sensibilities. Yet, without aiming at "those master strokes which make the sovereign charm of your Lordship's writings,"* I have, in one or two instances, endeavoured, at least, to avail myself of a practice, in the illustration of which you have been the ablest, if not the first, critic in "setting the judgment of the public right."

Thus, my Lord, in the essential qualities, whether of close relation to the subjects of the pamphlets now republished, or of indirect and skilful panegyric (whensoever I meant to be a panegyrist) upon the eminent personages to whom they are inscribed, this Dedication, I hope, will not be deficient. One of those qualities is, indeed, so obvious as to require no elucidation from a commentary: and the other, if it be less prominent and less glaring, may yet be traced in the conformity of this address to the example of Horace, where he compliments the emperor, not, with vague and unappropriate praise, but with such as springs up unex-

* See the Conclusion of the Discourse on Poetical Imitation.

pectedly, and yet naturally, from the topics which he was treating.

I know not, my Lord, to what extent you agree with the author of the seventh Dissertation, where he enumerates the most effectual methods of "doing honour to a writer."* But for your satisfaction, as well as for my own vindication, I will state the instances in which I have, and those in which I have not, complied with the rules which this supercilious dictator prescribes. "I have glanced at you." "I have spared your arguments." "I have called you learned." Perhaps, my Lord, I have by accident "quoted you." Thus far, as you will easily believe, it has been my fate, or my endeavour, to do you honour. But, lest I should give offence by doing you too much, I have not "adopted your subject." I have not "written against you," I have not "lent you any of my own arguments." I have not "called your conjectures ingenious or learned." I have not "called you my friend." Shall I then congratulate my good fortune, or commend my judgment, in thus erring on the safer side? And may I hope to escape the severities of your Lordship's displeasure,

* See the Dissertation on the Delicacy of Friendship, towards the conclusion.

The Letter-writer and I differ a little in our numerical as well as moral calculations. He has set down eight articles, where, according to my way of counting, are nine. Thus, in the last, he lumps together the acts of "calling a man learned," and calling him your friend, under one article. I think it more accurate to represent them as two, and certainly it is more to my purpose to consider them apart.

when I have committed less than half of the offences imputed to Dr. Jortin? The last of those offences will, indeed, under no change of circumstances, and through no length of time, be laid to my charge. I am too humble, my Lord, to accept what I do not merit, and too proud to claim for myself what I have never envied, when possessed by other men. Your Lordship, therefore, will, I am confident, give me credit, when I assure you that I never have been, and never shall be, an aspirant to that particular sort of distinction which is conferred by your friendship. Exempted as I thus am by my own habits and principles, by my esoteric and exoteric tenets, from one of these crimes, it rests with your Lordship to guard me in future from four others which I have hitherto escaped. Let me, however, confess to your Lordship, that my innocence is not entirely safe, and that, in consequence of such provocations as a man of your disposition may throw in my way, I may slide imperceptibly, or resolutely plunge, into a post of greater danger than that upon which I have now entered. In some moments, which I do not reckon amongst the weakest of my life, I have felt a pretty strong inclination to "adopt your subjects," to "write against you," to "lend you some of my own arguments," and "to call" a very few of "your conjectures ingenious, nay elegant." Should this inclination hereafter return, and should your Lordship compel me to indulge it, by sneering at what you will call the miserable trash,* and carping at what

* This emphatical but indelicate name is, I am told, given

shall myself call the wholesome truths contained

---

r our Aristarchus to some of Dr. Priestley's writings, which, gether with the writings, probably, of some other Doctors, e turns over to Dr. B——y, who, it should seem, is a spend- rift of time, and a reader of all such trash. Now, I by no eans assent to the opinions which Dr. Priestley has endea- oured to establish, in his History of the Corruptions of Chris- nity. I reverence the talents, and applaud the exertions, of s great antagonists, Mr. Badcock, Bishop Horsley, and Mr. owes. But, if it be really a waste of time for any dignified heologue to peruse that History, what shall be said for the aste of strength in three such learned men as have been em- oyed in confuting it? My readers will pardon a few grave d trite, but pertinent and salutary reflections, which the sub- ct of this notice has extorted from me. Men of high station the church, and of high reputation for knowledge, should e cautious in what terms, and before what hearers, they pass ntence upon books which they professedly do not deign to ad. A specious criticism, begotten, it may be, by rashness pon prejudice, and fostered by vanity or ill-nature, as soon as was produced—a random conjecture, suddenly struck out in ie conflicts of literary conversation—a sprightly effusion of it, forgotten perhaps by the speaker the moment after it was ttered—a sly and impertinent sneer, intended to convey more an was expressed, and more than could be proved, may have ery injurious effects upon the reputation of a writer. I sus- ect, too, that these effects are sometimes designedly produced y critics, who, finding the easy reception given to their own pinions, prefer the pride of decision to the toil of enquiry. he remarks of such men are eagerly caught up by hearers ho are incapable of forming for themselves a right judgment, r desirous of supporting an unfavourable judgment by the nction of a great name. They are triumphantly repeated in romiscuous, and sometimes, I fear, even in literary assemblies, d, like other calumnies, during a long and irregular course ey swell in bulk, without losing any portion of their original alignity.

in this address, I shall again "glance at you," I shall again "quote you." I shall again "call you learned," and, to make amends for the repetition of these heinous faults, I am resolved not again to "spare your arguments." In this last and worst stage of degeneracy, which it is possible for me to reach, I shall have the satisfaction of knowing, that in my conduct towards your Lordship I must, in two instances, stand acquitted of that guilt which Dr. Jortin is said to have incurred by his treatment of Bishop Warburton. As a disputant, I shall not insult you with a disavowal of hostilities. As a critic, I shall not alarm you with a menace of friendship.

Whatever "nonsensical scepticism," some men may affect, as to the writer of these Letters, it is not the jargon of "nonsensical dogmatism,"* to affirm, that, if he be really a different person from the Remarker on Mr. Hume, he could not address them to any other prelate with so much propriety as to yourself. Similarity of studies, interests, and temper, must be ranked among the most powerful ingredients of friendship; and friendship, my Lord, as you experimentally know, performs its best and proudest services in the form of dedication. Yet there are occasions, like the present, on which truth may be spoken by a dedicator, though he do not aspire to the more honourable appellation of a friend. I have already hinted to you, my Lord, that, neither in my estimation of books, nor in my attachments

* See the Remarks on Hume's Essay, p. 99.

and aversions to men, I am happy enough to boast of such qualifications as might expose me to your Lordship's regard in the latter character. But in discharging the duties of the former, my failure, if I should fail, is quite involuntary, and proceeds from the want of power rather than the want of inclination, to perpetuate the remembrance of your exertions in defence of Bishop Warburton.

Knowing, my Lord, the rooted antipathy which you bear to long epistolary introductions in classical writers, to long vernacular Sermons from Dr. Parr, and to long Latin Annotations from Philip D'Orville, I will take care, in the language of the Warburtonian school, not to stray beyond the limits of a just and legitimate dedication. The time of a Christian Bishop is, I am aware, not less precious than that of a heathen Emperor, and therefore I shall be cautious, like the Roman poet, not to waste it upon a longior Sermo,* than the subject indispensably requires.

---

* The Commentator explains *longo Sermone*, "a long Introduction," and in the close of his note he interweaves into the word *Sermone* the additional meaning of "familiar conversation." But to me, I confess, the word, as used here, suggests neither the one nor the other sense: and, even with the aid of the learned commentator, I am unable to see how, in one and the same place, it holds two meanings so very remote from each other. As to *longo*, the proper measure of it seems to me, not, as is commonly supposed, the length of any other Epistle compared with the length of this, nor yet, as the commentator supposes, the length of the Proem compared with the length of the Epistle, but, the length of the Epistle itself compared with the extent and magnitude of the subject. Sermo is used here

Suffer me, however, before I enter upon my conclusion, to recommend to your perusal a Greek quotation, which, I am persuaded, will not be less acceptable to you than it would have been to Dr. Jortin, because it has been "little blown upon." My reasons for introducing it are plain, but weighty. If, with a becoming mixture of courage and tenderness, your Lordship should vouchsafe to grant the patronage which I now ask in behalf of these friendless, these nameless, I will not say these graceless, babes, you may, without any imputation of arrogance, apply the first sentence to yourself. On the contrary, if, from motives which some men may impute to timidity, and others may charge with ingratitude, you should refuse that patronage, then, my Lord, every reader who remembers your connections with Bishop Warburton, your encomiums upon him, and your obligations to him, will find himself compelled to make a very invidious application of the second. Καθάπερ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν γενηθέντας, οἱ γενήσαντες, τῶν ὑποβαλλομένων μᾶλλον φιλοῦσιν, οὕτω καὶ οἱ εὕροντες τι τῶν μετεχόντων· ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τέκνων τούτων τῶν λόγων ὑπεραποτεθνήκασιν. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ Πάριοι λεγόμενοι σοφισταὶ, διὰ τὸ μὴ τεκεῖν αὐτοὶ, οὐ στέργουσιν, ἀλλὰ χρήματα λάβοντες, ἀποκηρύττουσι.

"But to declare my intentions at parting."*

---

in the same sense which it bears in line 5, Carmen 8, lib. 3, of the Odes, where the close of Bentley's Note may illustrate this disputed passage in the Epistle to Augustus.

* See Note on line 417 of the Art of Poetry.

en the author of the seventh Dissertation, and Letter to Dr. Leland, shall come forward into view of the public, be assured, my Lord, that writer of this Dedication will no longer stand n the smallest reserve with your Lordship and r admirers.

Ie is not an "answerer by profession,"* and, ex- : in the vindication of the truly good, or truly ıt, he never was an assailant by choice. He ws, my Lord, and, knowing, he despises, the sor- tribe of parasites who would bask in the sun- ıe of your favour. He equally knows, and ally despises, all the shallow pretenders to criti- n who implicitly repose on the authority of r decisions. Against these jackalls of literature, ɔse impertinence is of a piece with their impo- ːe, he will not condescend to wage a puny and lorious war:

"Optat aprum, aut fulvum descendere monte leonem."

t to your Lordship, when you are pleased to ımon him, "he will think it worth his while to lain himself more particularly," on the rectitude his intentions, and the "justness of his asser- ıs." Prepared as he is to defend them against unprejudiced and so powerful an antagonist, he ːiously wishes for an early opportunity of throw- off a disguise, from which even now, while he ops to the necessity of wearing it, he scorns to k protection. But the immediate addition of

---

See p. 4 of the Second Part of the Defence of the Divine ;ation.

his name, however it might flatter his own vanity, would neither conciliate your Lordship's favour, nor gratify, to any useful purpose, the reader's curiosity. Suffice it then to say, that he, as a scholar, has always surveyed your Lordship's character, without the partiality of the Remarker, and without the malignity of the Letter-writer—that, as a philosopher, he has often found "occasion to censure, where others admire"*—that, as a man, he long has thought, and ever will think of you, with a respect which falls somewhat short of idolatry, and with love, the "more perfect because it casteth out all fear."

I am, my Lord,
your obedient servant,
THE EDITOR.

Oct. 25th, 1788.

---

* See Remarks on Hume's Essay, p. 10.

THE

EDITOR'S PREFACE

TO THE

TWO TRACTS OF A WARBURTONIAN.

THE two following Tracts are supposed to be the productions of a great author: they are professedly drawn up in the defence of a greater; and they have, from their own intrinsic qualities, many strong claims to the notice of scholars. The letter to Dr. Leland is distinguished by a sort of sparkling vivacity and specious acuteness, which may, for a time, reconcile the reader to the want of solidity: and who will refuse the praise, at least of ingenuity, to the dissertation upon the delicacy of friendship? Perhaps it is difficult to name a book where the defects of the cause are so abundantly supplied by the skill of the advocate, or where the barrenness of the subject is more successfully fertilized by the fancy of the writer. But these literary excellencies, however extraordinary, and however indisputable, are not sufficient to atone for the moral imperfections which accompany them.

If the reader should hastily take offence at the sudden re-appearance of two tracts, upon which the author himself ought to look back with some emotions of shame, let him seriously weigh the reasons

for which they are, a second time, committed to the press.

By the writer of these pamphlets the characters of two very learned and worthy men were attacked with most unprovoked and unprecedented virulence.* The attempt to stifle them is, however, a very obscure and equivocal mark of repentance in the offender. Public and deliberate was the insult,† which he offered to the feelings of those whom he assailed, and therefore no compensation ought to be accepted which falls short of a direct and explicit retractation.

The letter to Dr. Jortin might, indeed, by an excess of candour, have been considered as the result of youthful ardour,‡ when the judgment of the

---

* The spirit of these two letters reminds me of a passage in Warburton's Dedication to the Freethinkers, where he speaks of "their buffooneries, which, like chewed bullets, are against the law of arms;" "and of their scurrilities," which he calls "the stinkpots of their offensive war."

† For every animadversion which I have made upon the Letter-writer, I have taken care to bring my vouchers with me in the letters themselves, which are set before the reader with their original stock of merit and demerit. To them I appeal for the justness of my indignation and the propriety of my censures. I have not forgotten the sage remark, which Warburton quotes from a great ancient, ἄλλως τὶς περὶ ἀληθείας λέγει, ἡ ἀλήθεια ἑαυτὴν ἑρμηνεύει. See the Dedication, vol. i. of the Divine Legation, p. 24. With this caution before me, I have not intentionally misrepresented the Letter-writer's motives, opinions, or words; and, at all events, I have left truth to speak for itself.

‡ I distrust the solidity of this excuse, even while I am writing it; for, if the author of the Dissertation upon the Deli-

iter was not matured; when his opinions of oks and men were not settled; when his imagi- ion was strongly impressed by the imposing endour of Warburton's talents, and his vanity itified by the flattering hope of Warburton's pro- tion.

Dulcis inexpertis cultura potentis amici.

But the interval between the two pamphlets—an erval of nearly ten years — left, one would have agined, room enough for the author to correct his rtialities, to soften his aversions, and to reflect ain and again upon all that might be blameable his motives, and all that had been injurious in e consequences of his first intemperate and inde- rous publication.

Had his "noble passion for mischief been con- it with"* the seventh Dissertation addressed to Dr. rtin, I should have given him all due praise for e glitter of his wit and the gaudiness of his elo- ence; and, at the same time, I should have ughed "at the pretensions of the book to reason- g and fact† as a mere flam, and not containing e word of truth from the beginning to the end." it when the same offensive spirit of contempt is, r the same unwarrantable purpose of degradation,

---

cy of Friendship had reached his fortieth year, my plea is ich weakened, and the word "youthful" can scarcely be jus- ed, unless by a reference to the Roman lawyers, who some- nes extended the application of juventa to the forty-fifth, d even fiftieth year. See Taylor's Civil Law, under the arti- "age," p. 254.

* See Remarks on Hume's Essay, p. 72. † Ibid. p. 64.

transferred from the writings of Dr. Jortin to those of Dr. Leland, I "see what the man would be at through all his disguises."* I see a very decisive proof, that the temper of the writer was not meliorated by time, by experience, by self-examination, or self-respect. I feel, at the same time, the most just and cogent reasons for laying him open to that ignominy, from which cowardice, indeed, may have tempted him to fly, but which he has not hitherto endeavoured to avert by apology or reformation. The indelicacies of enmity are not always justified by the zeal of friendship. The "immunities"† (as Johnson calls them) of "invisibility" cannot, in all cases, be employed to stifle the curiosity of the learned, or to avert the decision of the impartial. They may, indeed, screen the name of an author from the detection which he dreads; but they must not be permitted to shelter his publications from the reproach which they deserve.

Jortin and Leland now repose in the sanctuary of the grave, and are placed beyond the reach of human praise and human censure.‡ Be it so. But there

---

* See Remarks on Hume's Essay, p. 61.

† See Johnson's Political Tracts, p. 121.

‡ This is not mere conjecture. I have heard the Seventh Dissertation commended by persons who differed, as many other excellent men do, from the opinions which Dr. Jortin was suspected of holding upon some controverted points of religion. The learning and the judgment of those persons were not a match for their prejudices. They neither had, nor profess to have, any partiality for Warburton. But their dislike of Jortin was so strong, that they were pleased with any attack which,

was a time, when enemies, such as the unfettered opinions of one, and the shining talents of both, were sure to provoke, found a momentary gratification even from such charges as the Letter-writer ventured to allege. There was a time when those charges might have clogged their professional interests, and certainly did disturb the tranquillity of their minds. Yet, while they were living, no balm was poured into their wounded spirits by the hand that pierced them; and, if their characters after death remain unimpaired by the rude shocks of controversy, and the secret mines of slander, their triumph is to be ascribed partly to their own strength, and partly to the conscious weakness of their antagonist, rather than to his love of justice, or his love of peace. That antagonist, too, is, perhaps, still alive, and still finds his admirers among those who, themselves panting after greatness, are careful to utter only smooth things concerning the faults of

---

according to their estimation, tended in any degree to expose his possible failings, and to lessen his growing reputation. The number of such admirers is, however, not very considerable, and I am sure that the persons to whom I allude would have been unwilling to write against Dr. Jortin with the bitterness of which they seemed to approve in his supposed antagonist, who was then beginning to climb fast to fame, riches, and honour—to fame, let me acknowledge, which, by several of his writings, he has acquired deservedly—to riches, which he is said to dispense with elegant munificence—and to honours, which he, in some respects, is qualified to support with great dignity. My present concern with him takes its rise from faults, to which his reputation and his rank must unavoidably give more permanent, more extensive, and more dangerous effect.

the great. But his silence has not yet been represented even by his friends as the effect of contrition. His pen has not been employed in any subsequent publication to commend two writers, against whom he had formerly brandished such censures, as, according to his own estimation and his own wishes, were "aculeate and proper."* His example, and this is the worst of all—his example, I say, is at hand to encourage any future adventurer, who may first be disposed to attack the best books and the best men; and afterwards, when the real merits of the dispute, or the real character of his opponents, are known, may contrive to let his mischievous cavils quietly sink into oblivion, to skulk, as softly as he can, from detection and disgrace, nay, to set up serious pretensions to candour as a writer, to decency as an ecclesiastic, and meekness as a Christian.†

* See Bacon's Essay fifty-seventh.

† I shall not be surprised at any offence which the seeming severity of this passage may give to the very same persons who would pardon, and even commend, the Letter-writer to Dr. Jortin, for his endeavours to be far more severe. To such objections it were vain to oppose argument or fact. But, for the satisfaction of more intelligent and impartial readers, I shall produce part of a passage from Erasmus, in which he defends the avowed severity of Laurentius Valla against the treacherous candour and galling obloquy of Poggius. Videbat L. V. tam inveteratum morbum non posse sanari, nisi tristibus pharmacis, usturis ac sectionibus, idque magno cum dolore plurimorum. Neque vir acutus nesciebat, adeo delicatas esse mortalium aures, ut vix etiam inter bonos viros invenias, qui verum libenter audiat, foretque, ut non ii tantum exclamarent, quorum ulcera tetigisset, verum etiam illi, qui ex alieno malo sibi metum in-

ome of the parties are dead, and as the con-
ies in which they were engaged have ceased
ate the passions of men, this re-publication
ot the smallest tendency to "sow strife"*
scholars. But it may prevent, and certainly
tended to prevent them, from scattering the
of discord with wanton cruelty. It may de-
d certainly it is intended to deter them, from
ing any mean expectation, that a calumniator
erive security from the very failure of his
ies, or, that what he has repeatedly and deli-
y done in secret will not, sooner or later, be
ed openly. It may lessen, and certainly it is
ed to "lessen,† the number of those," who
too well of a man, by whom Warburton was
xtravagantly flattered, Leland most petulantly
d, and Jortin most inhumanly vilified. And
cannot hesitate to break in upon my English
ith a quotation, which may properly be trans-
from the general duties of society to the obli-
s which lie upon men of letters to support
ther under unmerited attacks, and to preserve
ommon rights against the most provoking

Tum post interposita pauca: Poggius, ut homo can-
ilicet, sine invidia passim habetur in manibus, lectitatur.
ius laborat invidia mordacitatis.—Erasmus in Epist. ad
h. Fischerum præfixa Vallæ libris de collatione N. T.

e foregoing passage in page 74 of Peter Wesseling's
tio Herodotea, and have omitted what was foreign to
ose.

Lowth's Letter, quoted among the Testimonia Auc-

the abovementioned letter.

mockeries of contempt, the most paltry tricks of encroachment, and the most outrageous violences of invasion.

Εἴπερ τὸν ἀδικοῦντ' ἀσμένως ἠμύνετο
Ἕκαστος ἡμῶν, καὶ συνηγωνίζετο,
Ἴσως νομίζων ἴδιον εἶναι τὸ γεγονὸς
Ἀδίκημα, καὶ συνέπραττον ἀλλήλοις πικρῶς·
Οὐκ ἂν ἐπὶ πλεῖον τὸ κακὸν ἡμῖν ἠύξετο
Τὸ τῶν πονηρῶν, ἀλλὰ παρατηρούμενοι,
Καὶ τυγχάνοντες ἧς ἔδει τιμωρίας,
Ἧττοι σπάνιοι σφόδρ' ἂν ἦσαν, ἢ πεπαυμένοι.
Menand. in Fratribus ex emendat. Bentl.

Animated by the strong indignation which throbs within my bosom at the foul arts of detraction so often practised by men of letters, I disdain either to crouch under the mandates, or to shrink from the frowns, of the Letter-writer on the Delicacy of Friendship. Yet, I should be sorry to find my opinions of Warburton misconceived by those who are incapable of misrepresenting them deliberately; and I am aware too, that they lie open to some misconception, from the comparative view which I have taken of that very able prelate and his celebrated adherent* in the foregoing Dedication.† For these

* Though my doubts were not always vanquished by the Bishop's arguments, though I sometimes smiled at his whimsical theories, and sometimes ventured to scowl at his violent invectives, yet I have often applied to the Divine Legation the candid and judicious language which Aristotle uses in the very book where he confutes some of the opinions imputed to Socrates by Plato: τὸ μὲν οὖν περιττὸν ἔχουσι πάντες οἱ τοῦ Σωκράτους λόγοι, καὶ τὸ κομψὸν, καὶ τὸ καινότομον, καὶ τὸ ζητητικὸν· καλῶς δὲ πάντα ἴσως χαλεπόν.—Repub. lib. ii. cap. 6.

† Upon the dignity of dedication-writing, I do not expect to

reasons I shall endeavour to explain myself in such a manner as to remove every scruple, and obviate every objection.

---

hear any saucy reflections from the Warburtonians, because Warburton himself is known to have written dedications often, and to have written them well. If they think preface-writing a degrading employment in him who has not written the book which accompnnies it, let me refer them to Johnson's preface to the Preceptor—to the prefaces written by Casaubon, Burman, Ernestus, Rhunkenius, and other scholars; and, if the practice of the *οἱ πάνυ* will not rescue preface-writing from the contempt of the Warburtonians, I must take the farther liberty to remind them of Bp. Warburton's preface to the first edition of Richardson's Clarissa—of Do's preface to Shakspeare's Plays —of Do's Preface to Mrs. Cockburn's Confutation of Rutherforth's Essay on Virtue—of Do's preface to the Candid Examination of Bp. Sherlock's Sermons—of Do's preface to Town's Critical Enquiry into the Opinions of the Antient Philosophers concerning the Nature of the Soul and a Future State, and their Method of the double Doctrine. I have myself read an ingenious preface to some select Poems of Cowley: I have heard of a pedantic thing called a preface to one Bellenden; and, indeed, it is no less usual for prefaces, or "discourses to that effect," to be prepared by editors than by authors, whether the authors themselves be living or dead—whether they be modern or antient—whether their works be of a sombrous or airy cast—whether (if we may argue from the example of Warburton) they be ranked in the class of sentimental novels, of dramatic writings, of ethical disquisitions, of theological controversies, or metaphysical investigations. Thus much I have said concerning the art itself. The merits of those who cultivate it are, it is true, very different. But even as a voluntary and disinterested act of drudgery performed by me, it may find a pittance of praise, not more scanty than that which has been earned by certain acts of vassalage, upon which some followers of Warburton have rested the tenure of their controversial fame.

What I have written about Warburton was suggested to me by a frequent, but unprejudiced perusal, and by a fond, though not undistinguishing approbation, of his works. I read them in the earliest and the happiest stages of my literary pursuits. They captivated my imagination — they exercised my reason—they directed my attention towards the most important topics, and they sent out my curiosity in quest of the most useful knowledge. The impressions made upon my mind by such a writer were strong and deep. After committing my thoughts lately to paper, I looked back to the description which Dr. Johnson had given of Dr. Warburton, in his elaborate preface to Shakspeare, and in his masterly Life of Pope. With satisfaction, and, indeed, with triumph, I found many of my opinions anticipated, and many confirmed. Johnson saw, as well as I do, his acute penetration, his various erudition, the inexhaustible fertility of his fancy, and the invincible fortitude of his spirit. He also saw, what I have myself without reserve and without apology condemned, the coarseness of his invectives, the wildness of his theories, and the defects of his style.

The indignation of all scholars has, I know, been long and justly armed against that contemptuous and domineering spirit which breaks out in Warburton's controversial writings, and which his admirers, instead of deploring, have been eager to defend and to imitate. Be it however remembered, that in pleading the cause of kindred genius, he

ıetimes pours out his commendations with a ıkness, ardour, and authority, which even his erest enemies cannot but acknowledge and ade. Of this kind are, his generous apology for paradoxes of Bayle, his eloquent encomiums on sagacity and learning of Cudworth, and his notribute of affection to the memory of a most r and illustrious friend, Francis Hare, Bishop of ichester. He that can read such passages withrapture, should suspect the sincerity of his own evolence—he that speaks of them without apbation, must renounce his pretensions to imparity of taste, to exactness of discrimination or cacy of feeling.

f learned men wish to judge of Warburton, er with the accuracy which is due to the "amude of his mind" and the dignity of his chaer, or with the candour which cannot surely be ısed to so many failings when accompanied by so ıy perfections, they would do well to examine portrait which Warburton has virtually drawn ıimself in his own writings, where it is well wn that his head was never employed either to trol or to disguise the violent emotions of his rt. In the opinion of such enquirers Warburwill either stand or fall upon the most fair and ourable conditions. He will not be exalted, ıaps, by the exuberant and courtly compliments he author of the Estimate, nor by the more ely and solemn decisions of the commentator n Horace: but he certainly will not be degraded

by the keen raillery of Mr. Edwards, n the rough reproaches of a far more powerful and far more respectable writer, whom I wish to remember under every other name than as the popular, for I cannot add, the victorious, adversary of Bp. Warburton.

Few men have made a more conspicuous figure than Warburton, upon the great theatre of learning. Few have been engaged in more bustling and splendid scenes. Few have sustained more difficult or more interesting characters. It is therefore to be lamented, that the public have not yet been favoured with a regular and impartial account * of his progress in knowledge; of his advancement in the church; of the embarrassments with which he

---

* "I believe (to adopt the words of Milton in his Treatise on Education) that the life of Warburton is not a bow, in which every man can shoot who counts himself a biographer, but will require sinews almost equal to those which Homer gave Ulysses: yet I am withal persuaded that," in certain hands, "it may prove much more easy in the assay than is now seen at distance, and much more illustrious."

No man living is, in my opinion, more able than Dr. Balguy to unfold with precision the character of Bp. Warburton, or to state with impartiality the merits of those controversies in which he was engaged. But bodily infirmities have already deprived the English Church of this great and good man's protection as a prelate, who would have been vigilant without officiousness, firm without obstinacy, and pious without superstition. The same unhappy and unalterable cause will, I fear, deprive posterity also of that instruction which, as a biographer of Warburton, he was qualified to convey, by solid learning, by an erect and manly spirit, by habits of the most exact and enlarged thinking, and by a style which is equally pure, elegant, and nervous. The history of those who defended, and

struggled, and over which he triumphed: of the connections which he formed: of the provocations by which he was harassed; and especially of the opinions which in the cooler and more serious reflections of his old age, he really entertained of all his own hardier exertions made in the vigour of his youth. But, whatever materials for the history of his life may be in the hands of his executors, and whatever may be the abilities of those who shall have the courage to use them, his character will never be drawn with more justness of design, or more strength of colouring, than have already been employed by the great biographer of the English poets.

The dawn of Warburton's fame was overspread with many clouds, which the native force of his mind quickly dispelled. Soon after his emersion from them, he was honoured by the friendship of Pope, and the enmity of Bolingbroke. In the fulness of his meridian glory, he was caressed by Lord Hardwick and Lord Mansfield; and his setting lustre was viewed with nobler feelings than those of mere forgiveness, by the amiable and venerable Dr. Lowth. Hallifax revered him, Balguy loved him, and, in two immortal works, Johnson has stood forth in the foremost rank of his admirers.

---

those who opposed Warburton, would in the hands of so consummate an artist, have been a most instructive and interesting work, not unworthy of being called in Cicero's language a πεπλογραφια Varronis. Vid. Ep. ad Att. lib. xvi. ep. 11.

By the testimony of such a man, impertinence must be abashed, and malignity itself must be softened. Of literary merit, Johnson as we all know, was a sagacious, but a most severe judge. Such was his discernment, that he pierced into the most secret springs of human actions, and such was his integrity, that he always weighed the moral characters of his fellow creatures in the "balance of the sanctuary." He was too courageous to propitiate a rival, and too proud to truckle to a superior. Warburton he knew, as I know him, and as every man of sense and virtue would wish to be known—I mean both from his own writings, and from the writings of those who dissented from his principles, or who envied his reputation. But as to favours, he had never received or asked any from the Bishop of Gloucester; and if my memory fails me not, he had seen him only once, when they met almost without design, conversed without much effort, and parted without any lasting impressions of hatred or affection. Yet, with all the ardour of sympathetic genius, Johnson has done that spontaneously and ably, which by some writers had been before attempted injudiciously, and which by others, from whom more successful attempts might have been expected, has not hitherto been done at all. He spoke well of Warburton, without insulting those whom Warburton despised. He suppressed not the imperfections of this extraordinary man, while he endeavoured to do justice to his numerous and transcendental excellencies. He defended him when

living amidst the clamours of his enemies, and praised him when dead, amidst the silence of his friends. *

---

* The only exception (if it be one) to the silence of Warburton's friends, is the inscription upon his monument, erected in Gloucester cathedral. That inscription does not aim at the simplicity of an ancient, or the splendour of a modern epitaph. It is neither energetic from conciseness, nor dignified from amplification. It is tamely correct, coldly complimentary, and at the same time, totally destitute of those marked and appropriate commendations, for which the peculiar opinions and most wonderful talents of Dr. W. might have supplied very copious materials to his once zealous panegyrists.

In that excellent repository of various and useful knowledge the Gentleman's Magazine, there is a just and elegant critique on the writings of Warburton in page 340 of the volume for the year 1779. Some curious and interesting memoirs of his life are to be found in page 357, and 474, in the volume for 1780.

The reader will thank me for producing the following passage, which does honour to the judgment and sensibility of the writer.

"His publications were numerous, and, from the applause they obtained, they seem to promise a celebrity of greater length of time than they have experienced. But his renown vanished, as soon as his infirmities secluded him from the world, and it would be difficult to point out a single compliment paid to him, or his writings, since the time that he ceased to write. He even wanted a friend to pay a decent tribute to his memory in the fugitive publications of the day, the literary portrait excepted, which was in our Magazine for 1779." But the Editor candidly subjoins in a note the following acknowledgment:

"Amongst other channels of information it would be illiberal not to mention that we are very materially indebted to the Anecdotes of Bishop Warburton, which have appeared in the Westminster Magazine."

I have stated these facts, not from any abject view of palliating the censures which I may have

---

In the Westminster Magazine for October, November, December, 1779, and in the Appendix for the same year, I have myself lately met with some biographical and literary anecdotes of Dr. Warburton, which for accuracy of detail, and justness of observation, deserve the attention and the thanks of every scholar. I need not make any apology for the following quotations:

"A relaxation of mind so far pervades the whole body of the people, that the great writers of this nation, who used to be studied with the utmost diligence, are now totally disregarded."

* * * * *

"In this general neglect, it will not be surprizing to find, that a writer of great renown in this day should live to see himself only on the level with common men, and his writings mouldering in the warehouses of his bookseller. Through the object of fulsome adulation while his faculties were unimpaired, he lived several years longer than his fame; and when he died, though many of his flatterers remained, and some who were under great obligations to him, yet not one of them had gratitude enough to pay the slightest tribute to his memory. To the disgrace of his literary connection, he sunk silently into the grave, unnoticed and unlamented."—See W. M. for 1779, page 500.

"In his works he exhibited great strokes of an original and powerful genius, much reading with a nervous but not a polished style. At his outset in life he was suspected of being inclined to infidelity, and it was not until many years had elapsed, that the orthodoxy of his opinions was generally assented to. His publications, from the present accounts, will appear to have been very numerous, and from the flatteries of his friends they seemed to promise a celebrity of greater length of time than they have experienced. If it was not for his connection with Mr. Pope, he would be in danger of being lost as a writer in a few years His renown vanished as soon as his in-

passed upon Warburton's failings, nor yet from any vain confidence in my abilities to exalt his character, but in obedience to the warm and honest dictates of my own mind—of a mind, which he has often enlightened, often enchanted, and, in some degree, I would hope, improved.

> His saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani
> Munere.

---

firmities secluded him from the world; and with his abilities the sycophants who surrounded him also took their flight. It would be difficult to point out a single compliment paid to him, or his writings, since the time that he ceased to write: a plain proof that he held those who professed themselves to be his friends, not by the ties of affection or esteem, but by fear."—See W. M. for 1779, 663.

Why Dr. Warburton was ever suspected even of secret infidelity I know not. But I am persuaded that his writings were sincerely intended to establish the truth of Christianity, and that many of them are worthy of the great and good cause in which they were honourably employed. What he was inclined to think upon subjects of religion, before perhaps he had either leisure or ability to examine them, depends only upon obscure surmise or vague report. But we have the stubborn evidence of facts to ascertain what he really did think, after he had searched and believed. As to the charge of heterodoxy, I shall leave his R. R. biographer to admit or to confute it, as he may find himself able. But the accusation of Deism, which has more than once been brought against his writings, is too wicked to escape without some mark of reprobation, and too weak to deserve a serious and formal reply. It was malignantly broached at first by an English dunce, whose blunders and calumnies are now happily forgotten. It afterwards was petulantly repeated by a French buffoon, whose morality is not commensurate with his wit, and many of whose assertions in history and biography every man of sense reads with distrust, and sometimes with contempt.

From what Johnson and I have said in favour of Warburton, there is an easy and natural transition to what his professed biographers may intend to say. A costly and splendid edition of Warburton's works was published in the spring of 1788, and prefixed to it as an advertisement, which cannot, I think, be quite satisfactory to his admirers, and which must be alarming to such of his opponents as may now be living. It runs thus:—"The reader will expect some account of the life, writings, and character of the author to be prefixed to this complete edition of his works: he is therefore informed, that a discourse to that effect hath been prepared and will be published, but not now, for reasons that will be seen hereafter." We are then told, that "purchasers, upon producing tickets which are to be delivered to them by the bookseller, will be furnished with the life." To this consolatory promise is subjoined a very accurate but jejune account of the works inserted in the present edition, and "for the rest the reader is referred to the author's life at large."

Now I confess there is something very mysterious to my mind, both in the small number* of copies lately published, and in the temporary delay

* I am told that only 250 copies were printed: I ought, however, to add that, for the sake of those who had purchased the former editions of Warburton's Works, a separate volume has been published containing the additional matter. But if a new and expensive edition of the whole was at all necessary, I think it difficult to account for the choice of so small a number as that above-mentioned.

of the Life—a number which seems to insinuate, either that Warburton's writings were too excellent for the gross taste of the public, or that the public had shewn some inauspicious symptoms of indifference about Warburton's writings—a delay which not only thwarts the acknowledged expectation of the reader, but which the editor, it should seem, assumes a right of extending to as long a time, as he shall think proper. From the cautious and enigmatical manner, too, in which the advertisement is drawn up, it may be rather difficult to determine positively by whom that "discourse hath been prepared." The editor certainly has seen it: he probably is in possession of it. He has reasons for holding it back now—and he promises to publish, or to let it be published hereafter. But whether it be written, as Aristotle would say, by a Socrates or a Callias,* is left in some uncertainty. A sore and captious objector might here say, that if it be tainted with the genuine spirit of the Warburtonian School, the publication of it may very properly be deferred ad Græcas Calendas. He might insinuate, that the editor knows best how far the reputation of the biographer himself may be staked in the account which he has given of Warburton, and that possibly he, for many reasons, thinks it safer to dis-

* The learned reader need not be informed of the manner in which Aristotle sometimes uses the names of Socrates, Callias, Coriscus and Cleon. Vide Arist. Rhet. lib. ii. cap. 4, Eudem. lib. ii. cap. 2, Metaphysic. lib. i. cap. 1 and 7, lib. v. cap. 6, lib vii. cap. 8, 11, 15, lib. xiv. cap. 3, Sophist. Elench. cap. 5, 14, 17, 22, 32.

appoint, for a time, the curiosity of his readers, than to appeal precipitately to their justice, or to encounter their indignation. He might add, that a discourse which professes to convey a fair, exact, and enlarged view of the life, writings, and character of Warburton, is a most arduous and a most perilous undertaking: that it requires not merely the ordinary decorations of learning, or the ordinary arts of reasoning, but a judgment most impartial, and a spirit most collected and most intrepid; and that in feeble or treacherous hands, it will conciliate few friends, and provoke many enemies.

——— incedit per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso.

In me, however, who have not been initiated either into the greater or the lesser mysteries of the Warburtonians, it might be thought presumptuous to draw aside one corner of the veil from those subjects which our great Hierophant has, for the present, so industriously and skilfully muffled up in secrecy. I will not, therefore profess, like some critics, to reveal* what I never knew, nor will I

* The Bishop's representation of the greater and lesser mysteries was examined with great accuracy and opposed with great candour by the learned Dr. John Leland, in the eighth and ninth chapters, part the first, of his work upon the advantage and necessity of the Christian Revelation. I have read with much pleasure, and very little conviction, "a Dissertation on the Mysteries, wherein the opinions of Bishop Warburton and Dr. Leland are particularly considered." It was published without a name in 1766; it was intended as an answer to Leland, the first edition of whose work came out in 1764; and it

filch,* or even borrow, any sordid ingots of erudition from other writers, to spread them in a thin and glittering surface over my own ignorance. I will forbear, with a kind of religious horror, from attempting to conjecture what the reasons of the editor are. But for the honour of a man whose delicacies both in friendship and enmity are equally well known, I will take the liberty of informing the readers of Warburton, what those reasons are not —they are not reasons of fear in the R. R. Editor, either from the cavils of the illiterate and prejudiced, whom a writer of his great abilities, great reputation, and great rank, may with impunity despise, or from the objections of the wise and good, whom (as the race of them, I hope, will not speedily be extinct), the discourse, which is not unlikely to displease them now, cannot be very

---

has been ascribed, not improbably, to the candid examiner of Sherlock's Discourses. Συνέσει μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀγχινοίᾳ, καὶ δριμύτητι, πάμπολυ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἀπὸ Βαρβουρτώνου διέφερε.—Vide Lucian. op. tom. ii, p. 210, edit. Reitz.

* The greater part of Warburton's quotations about the mysteries may be found in Meursius's Eleusis. I forget whether the Bishop makes a direct acknowledgment of his obligations to this diligent, learned, and judicious collector. I say learned and judicious, as well as diligent, in opposition to that spirit of the Warburtonians which induces one of them to call the Author of the Credibility of the Gospel History, "the laborious Dr. Lardner;" and another, to nick-name Mr. Hume's History of England the "most readable history we have." The disciples of this school generally dispense their praise with a discretion which prevents its being exhausted by their occasional prodigality. To the profane, σπείρουσι χειρὶ, but to the initiated, ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ.

likely to satisfy hereafter—they are not reasons of uncommon candour or common justice to the surviving opponents of Bishop Warburton: for as the discourse, let it contain what it will, must be produced at last, they would rather, doubtless, meet an attack which they may hope to repel while they are living, than be exposed after their death to representations of facts and opinions which, if they were quite fair and quite inoffensive, would probably not for a moment be suppressed—they are not reasons of tenderness to the biographer himself: for the editor,* undoubtedly, will never publish, or be concerned in publishing, what, after long delay and much correction, he does not approve; and as to the biographer, he, I should hope, has not ventured, like the author of the seventh Dissertation, to "prepare a Discourse" which he is unwilling to avow or unable to defend. Παῤῥών δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω.

When the work of a great writer is long kept back from the eye of the public, we are to conclude, not that his whole time is laid out upon it, but that he at intervals retrenches or adds to the matter, and corrects or polishes the style, as different opportu-

* I suspect that the editor is not a different person from the biographer; but I will not hazard any assertion upon the subject, lest I should be caught in the toils which some men may spread for a conclusion not directly warranted by their own premises. I have sometimes thought that in weightier matters the Warburtonians are too much addicted to a practice which their master condemns in Bayle and in Plutarch. They "leave their propositions in that convenient state of ambiguity which is necessary to give a paradox the air and reputation of an oracle."—See book iii. sect. 6, of the D. L.

nities may arise, different circumstances may require, or different states of his own mind may dictate amendment or alteration. We may therefore expect to see the Life of Warburton wrought up to the highest degree of perfection which the united force of taste, diligence, and discretion in the biographer can attain.

Warburton paid the last awful debt of nature in June 1779. If then we suppose some rude outlines of his character to have been sketched out soon after the event, when the thoughts of his friends must have been naturally turned towards his attainments, his virtues, and his death, the time expended upon this piece of biographical painting already includes the nine years employed upon a less important work to which Horace pertinently alludes, and which Catullus expressly names.*

Should the artist detain a little longer his favourite picture,† that it may receive fresh touches and retouches, as either his judgment, or his hopes or his fears may suggest; that in one place the light may be heightened, and the shade darkened in another; that some characters may be brought more conspicuously into the foreground, and others

* Vid. Horat. de Ar. Poet. l. 388, et Catull. de Smyrna Cinnæ Poetæ, lin. 1 et 2.

† I would recommend it to the biographer to consider what Eunapius says of the life of Alypius writen by Iamblichus, *Ἔοικεν ὁ θαυμάσιος Ἰάμβλιχος ταυτὸν πεπονθέναι τοῖς γραφικοῖς, οἳ τοὺς ἐν ὥρᾳ γράφοντες, ὅταν χαρίσασθαί τι παρ' ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὴν γραφὴν βουληθῶσι, τὸ πᾶν εἶδος τῆς ὁμοιώσεως διαφθείρουσιν, ὥστε ἅμαρτε τοῦ παραδείγματος ἡμαρτηκέναι καὶ τοῦ κάλλους.*— Eunap. in Vit. Iamblich. p. 31. edit. Antverp.

thrown back so as to be less distinctly seen, the life of Warburton will furnish the English language with a proverbial expression not less emphatical than the Latin poem of Cinna, and the Greek panegyric of Isocrates.

It may be worth while to observe, that this last edition of Warburton's works is called complete, though neither the enquiry into prodigies, nor the translations are contained in it. No reason is assigned by the R. R. Editor for omitting them—no notice is taken that they ever were published by Warburton—no intimation is given that his Editor intends to publish them hereafter. But this unexpected, and I hope not unwelcome republication, will perhaps induce him * to "prepare a discourse to that effect."

---

* Lowth, in his letter to Warburton, enumerates the different kinds of correction, which he inflicted or caused to be inflicted upon his answerers. Now the worst that can be done in this way by the "beadle" of a beadle is below contempt. But as the present editor, and in truth restorer of the bishop's two neglected tracts cannot aspire like Bishop Lowth, to the solemnities of a regular execution upon a scaffold, he will be doomed, probably, to be thrust down into some dungeon of a note, and to be stretched upon the rack of cavil and misrepresentation by his ingenious tormentor. Be it so. He knows (as Cicero says of Hortensius in Divinat. cont. Cæcil.) all the modes of attack which are most successfully practised by his antagonists; and he hopes to meet the blow, not wholly unprepared both to encounter argument and to repel accusation. But if the aid of sneers be once called in, either to reinforce a clumsy and languid witticism, or to cover the retreat of a crippled and feeble argument, he will consider the use of such auxiliaries as a declaration that no quarter is to be given, and as a signal for carrying on what Thucydides calls πόλεμον ἄκρητον καὶ ἄσπονδον.

From the ingenuous editor and the wary biographer, I gladly return to Warburton himself and his critics.

As to the particular points which are discussed in the letters addressed to Dr. Jortin and Dr. Leland, I shall take this opportunity of delivering my opinion about them plainly and concisely. Upon the subject of eloquence I accede to Leland's very judicious objections against the chimerical position of Warburton, and I also must add, in Leland's emphatical words, that "the bishop has conveyed his argument in all the most striking forms of eloquence, and with the spirit and energy of an ancient orator."*

In regard to the sixth book of the Æneid I have always admired the ingenuity of Warburton's hypothesis. I have in the course of my own reading, frequently examined his quotations. I have never assented to his conclusions. I applaud Dr. Jortin for speaking of Warburton's interpretations in terms of measured praise; and I consider it as completely refuted in a most clear, elegant, and decisive work of criticism, which could not indeed derive authority from the greatest name, but to which the greatest name might with propriety have been affixed. †

From Warburton, whom I have here commended without adulation, as I had before censured him

* Leland on Eloquence, cap. 4.

† This book is ascribed, and I think with great probability, to the learned and ingenious author, to whom the public is indebted for the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Be the writer who he will, the reader will say with me, that the work is πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβάς.

without acrimony, I now proceed to speak more at large of Leland and Jortin. For them too I have a blessing, which if it be less efficacious than that of the patriarch, is however, not less sincere. Virtually and by implication, they were defended in the preceding dedication. But they have a title to more direct and explicit praise, and I have chosen this part of the preface as a proper place for bestowing it.

Of Leland my opinion is not like the Letter-writer's, founded upon hear-say evidence,* nor is it determined solely by the great authority of Dr. Johnson, who always mentioned Dr. Leland with cordial regard and with marked respect. It might perhaps be invidious for me to hazard a favourable decision upon his history of Ireland, because the merits of that work have been disputed by critics, some of whom are I think warped in their judgments by literary, others by national, and more, I have reason to believe, by personal prejudices. But I may with confidence appeal to writings which have long contributed to public amusement, and have often been honoured by public approbation —to the life of Philip, and to the translation of Demosthenes, which the Letter-writer professes to have not read—to the judicious dissertation upon eloquence, which the Letter-writer did vouchsafe to read before he answered it—to the spirited defence of that dissertation, which the Letter-writer probably has read, but never attempted to answer. The life

* See the letter to Leland in the conclusion.

of Philip contains many curious researches into the principles of government established among the leading states of Greece; many sagacious remarks on their intestine discords; many exact descriptions of their most celebrated characters, together with an extensive and correct view of those subtle intrigues, and those ambitious projects, by which Philip * at a favourable crisis gradually obtained an unexampled and fatal mastery over the Grecian republics. In the translation of Demothenes Leland unites the man of taste with the man of learning, and shews himself to have possessed not only a competent knowledge of the Greek language, but that clearness in his own conceptions, and that animation in his feelings, which enabled him to catch the real meaning, and to preserve the genuine spirit of the most perfect orator that Athens ever produced. Through the dissertation upon eloquence and the defence of it, we see great accuracy of erudition, great perspicuity and strength of style, and above all a stoutness of judgment, which in traversing the open and spacious walks of literature, disdained to be led captive, either by the sorceries of a self-deluded visionary, or the decrees of a self-created despot.

As to Jortin, whether I look back to his verse, to his prose, to his critical, or to his theological works,

* Upon this subject Valckenaer has written a very learned and judicious Diatribe, which was delivered at Franequer, 1760, and published (with the speeches of Hemsterhuis) at Leyden in 1784.

there are few authors to whom I am so much indebted for rational entertainment, or for solid instruction. Learned he was without pedantry. He was ingenious without the affectation of singularity. He was a lover of truth without hovering over the gloomy abyss of scepticism, and a friend to free enquiry without roving into the dreary and pathless wilds of latitudinarianism. He had a heart which never disgraced the powers of his understanding. With a lively imagination, an elegant taste, and a judgment most masculine and most correct, he united the artless and amiable negligence of a school-boy. Wit * without ill nature, and sense without effort, he could at will scatter upon every subject; and in every book the writer presents us with a near and distinct view of the real man.

——ut omnis
Votiva pateat tanquam descripta tabella
Vita senis.——Hor. Sat. 1. lib. ii.

---

* Let me not be charged with pedantry, if, for the want of English words equally correspondent with my ideas, I say, that in the lighter parts of Jortin's writings may be found that εὐτραπελία which is defined by Aristotle πεπαιδευμένη ὕβρις and that, in the more serious is preserved that σεμνότης, which, the same Philosopher most accurately and beautifully explains, μαλακὴ καὶ ευσχήμων βαρύτης. Rhetoric. lib. 2. cap. 12. and 17.

Knowing that Greek is thought by some nicer readers to deform an English page, and being perhaps in the habit of remembering rather more passages than I dare produce, I have often driven down my quotations into a note for refuge. This apology I make once for all, and I trust that it will satisfy all readers except those who may wish to see quotations purified from the dregs of antiquity through the strainers of an English translation

Persium non legere curo; Decium Lælium volo.

His style, though inartificial, is sometimes elevated: though familiar, it is never mean; and though employed upon various topics of theology, ethics, and criticism, it is not arrayed in any delusive resemblance, either of solemnity from fanatical cant, of profoundness from scholastic jargon, of precision from the crabbed formalities of cloudy philologists, or of refinement from the technical babble of frivolous connoisseurs.

At the shadowy and fleeting reputation which is sometimes gained by the petty frolics of literary vanity, or the mischievous struggles of controversial rage, Jortin never grasped. Truth, which some men are ambitious of seizing by surprize in the trackless and dark recess, he was content to overtake in the broad and beaten path: and in the pursuit of it, if he does not excite our astonishment by the rapidity of his strides, he at least secures our confidence by the firmness of his step. To the examination of positions advanced by other men he always brought a mind, which neither prepossession had seduced, nor malevolence polluted. He imposed not his own conjectures as infallible and irresistible truths, nor endeavoured to give an air of importance to trifles by dogmatical vehemence. He could support his more serious opinions without the versatility of a sophist, the fierceness of a disputant, or the impertinence of a buffoon — more than this — he could relinquish or correct them with the calm and steady dignity of a writer, who, while he yielded something to the arguments of his antagonists, was conscious of retaining enough to com-

mand their respect. He had too much discernment to confound difference of opinion with malignity or dulness, and too much candour to insult where he could not persuade. Though his sensibilities were neither coarse nor sluggish, he was yet exempt from those fickle humours, those rankling jealousies, and that restless waywardness which men of the brightest talents are too prone to indulge. He carried with him into every station in which he was placed, and every subject which he explored, a solid greatness of soul which could spare an inferior, though in the offensive form of an adversary, and endure an equal with or without the sacred name of friend. The importance of commendation, as well to him who bestows as to him who claims it, he estimated not only with justice but with delicacy, and therefore he neither wantonly lavished it, nor withheld it austerely. But invective he neither provoked nor feared; and as to the severities of contempt he reserved them for occasions where alone they could be employed with propriety, and where by himself they always were employed with effect—for the chastisement of arrogant dunces, of censorious sciolists, of intolerant bigots in every sect, and unprincipled impostors in every profession. Distinguished in various forms of literary composition, engaged in various duties of his ecclesiastical profession, and blessed with a long and honourable life, he nobly exemplified that rare and illustrious virtue of charity, which Leland in his reply to the Letter-writer thus eloquently describes: "Charity never misrepresents; never ascribes obnoxious prin-

ciples or mistaken opinions to an opponent, which he himself disavows; is not so earnest in refuting as to fancy positions never asserted, and to extend its censure to opinions which will perhaps be delivered: Charity is utterly averse to sneering, the most despicable species of ridicule, that most despicable subterfuge of an important objector: Charity never supposes that all sense and knowledge are confined to a particular circle, to a district, or to a country: Charity never condemns and embraces principles in the same breath; never professes to confute what it acknowledges to be just, never presumes to bear down an adversary with confident assertions: Charity does not call dissent insolence, or the want of implicit submission a want of common respect." *

This, I cannot help exclaiming in the words of the R. R. Remarker: "this is the solution of a philosopher indeed; clear, simple, manly, rational, and striking conviction in every word, unlike the refined and fantastic nonsense of a writer of paradoxes." †

The esteem, the affection, the reverence which I feel for so profound a scholar, and so honest a man as Dr. Jortin, make me wholly indifferent to the praise and censure of those who vilify without reading his writings, or read them without finding some incentive to study, some proficiency in knowledge, or some improvement in virtue.

* Page 51 of the quarto edition of Dr. Leland's answer, printed at London, 1765.

† See remarks on Hume, p. 93.

A

LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REV. DR. MILNER;

OCCASIONED BY SOME PASSAGES CONTAINED IN HIS BOOK,

INTITULED,

"THE END OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY."

The reasons for publishing this posthumous work of Dr. Parr have been stated by the Rev. John Lynes, in his Preface.

It was originally intended for the Gentleman's Magazine; but the work grew too bulky for insertion in that useful repository, and on that account was laid aside, at the time, by the author, who has left behind him a large collection of observations on points of controversy between Catholics and Protestants.

A

LETTER TO THE REV. DR. MILNER.

REVEREND AND LEARNED SIR,

I HAVE lately read, with the greatest attention, a very interesting and elaborate work, which bears your celebrated name, and to which you have prefixed this title: "The End of Religious Controversy, in a friendly Correspondence between a religious Society of Protestants and a Roman Catholic Divine, addressed to the Right Reverend Dr. Burgess, Lord Bishop of St. David's, in answer to his Lordship's Protestant Catechism."

The contents of that book have not lessened the high opinion which I had long entertained of your acuteness as a polemic, your various researches as a theologian, and your talent for clear and animated composition. I acknowledge, too, that in my judgment you have been successful in your endeavours to vindicate the members of the Church of Rome from the imputations of impiety, idolatry, and blasphemy, in their worship of glorified saints, and in their adoration of the sacramental elements, which they believe to have been mystically transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ.

The adamantine and imperishable work of Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity, and the controversial writings of Jeremy Taylor, fraught, as they are, with guileless ardour, with peerless eloquence, and with the richest stores of knowledge, historical, classical, scholastic, and theological, may be considered as irrefragable proofs of their pure, affectionate, and dutiful attachment to the reformed Church of England. Why then should I dissemble that, in the words of these excellent men, as quoted by yourself (in p. 237 and p. 265, part iii. 5th edit.), are contained the opinions which I hold upon a part of the controversy, which has long subsisted between Romanists and Protestants, about the consecrated elements in the Communion? "The object of their (the Catholics') adoration in the Sacrament is the true and eternal God, hypostatically united with his holy humanity, which humanity they believe actually present under the veil of the Sacrament; and if they thought him not present, they are so far from worshipping the bread, that they profess it idolatry to do so."—Dr. Jeremy Taylor, Bishop of Down, Liberty of Prophesying, sect. 20.

"I wish men would give themselves more to meditate with silence on what we have in the Sacrament, and less to dispute on the manner how. Sith we all agree that Christ, by the Sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by consubstantiation or else by transubstantiation?" Eccles. Polit. B. v. 67. (see note, page 274, 5th edit.) Content I am to speak

of your tenets upon the Sacrament as erroneous and unscriptural only; and in truth, Sir, I have often had most sincerely and seriously to disapprove of the acrimonious language which has been unnecessarily and unbecomingly employed by some of your opponents; and, I add, not less unnecessarily and unbecomingly by yourselves.

I leave it, Reverend Sir, with many learned, sagacious, and truly pious members of the Church of England, to discuss the merits of your cause, the accuracy of your statements, and the validity of your arguments, upon the following particulars:

"That Bishop Porteus is to be classed with other bigoted controvertists, who have holden up to the public a caricature of the Church of Rome:" (part iii. p. 373.) "that, when he represents purgatory, in the present Popish sense, as not heard of for four hundred years after Christ; nor universally received for a thousand years; nor almost in any other church than that of Rome to this day:"—"here are no less than three egregious falsities." (Part iii. p. 311.) And "you have often wondered at the confidence with which his Lordship asserts and denies facts of antient church history, in opposition to the known truth." (Part iii. p. 350.) That Bishop Hoadley not only had undermined the church he professed to support in her doctrines and discipline, as you have demonstrated in your Letters to a Prebendary, but that he had founded a school of complete Socinianism, and that Bishop Shipley is to be reckoned in the the first rank of his scholars. (Part ii. p. 127.) And here, Sir, you will permit me to ob-

serve, that, if your accusation against Hoadley be well founded, Dr. Balguy, whom you describe (part i. p. 67,) as "the most clear-headed writer, and renowned defender of the Establishment whom you had the happiness of being acquainted with," and as having Bishop Hoadley for his friend and master, (part i. p. 96,) could hardly have escaped the taint of "the damnable and cursed heresy of Socinianism," as it is termed in Bishop Sparrow's Collection of Canons twice quoted by yourself with approbation. (Part i. p. 92, and part ii. p. 126.) And here, Sir, may I be permitted to ask, whether the venerable Bishop Lowth, who in early life was closely connected with Bishop Hoadley, must, in consequence of that connection, be considered, for a time at least, favourable to Socinianism?

That "Chillingworth, who had been first a Protestant, next became a Catholic, and then returned in part to his former creed, gave, last of all, into Socinianism, which his writings greatly promoted." (Part i. p. 55.) That, "when you were defending the Articles and Liturgy of the Established Church, as well as your own, upon this point," (i. e. as appears from the context, the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation,) "you found the religious infection infinitely more extensive than you apprehended; the celebrated professors of divinity in the University delivering Dr. Balguy's doctrine to the young clergy in their public lectures, and the most enlightened Bishops publishing it in their pastoral and other works." That "Dr. Horsley, the great ornament of the episcopal bench, who protected

both in and out of parliament, does not fall un- this censure of holding that Christ has left us exterior means of grace; and that, of course, tism and the Lord's Supper, (which are declared ssary for salvation in the Catechism,) produce spiritual effect at all; and, in short, that all teries, and among the rest those of the Trinity Incarnation, (for denying which the Prelates of Church of England have sent so many pro- ed Protestants to the stake, in the reigns of rard, Elizabeth, and James I.) are mere non- se." (Part ii. p. 126.) That "most modern Pro- ants of eminence deny Christ to be God." (Part . 75.) And as you have not limited this posi- by any designation of place, I must suppose to include under it modern eminent members he Church of England, modern eminent English senters, and modern Protestants of eminence in ign countries. That "many personages in a re elevated rank of life, whose education and lies enable them to form a more just idea of the gious and moral principles of their ancestors, efactors, and founders, in short, of their acknow- ed fathers and saints, combine to load these ers and saints with calumnies and misrepre- tations, which they must know to be utterly e." (Part iii. p. 241.) That "Mede, and a hun- d other Protestant controvertists, speak in blas- mous terms of your Communion of Saints." rt iii. p. 247.) I dispute not your accuracy in epting Bishop Horsley; but I am really unable point out a e or dignitary in the Church.

of England, now living, who deserves to fall under the general censure of considering all mysteries as mere nonsense.

That "Bishop Jewel, by his vain boasting, or rather deliberate impugning of the known truth, scandalized sober and learned Protestants; that he was guilty of hypocrisy; and that in quoting the fathers he shamefully falsified them." (Part ii. p. 198.) That "Cranmer, from his youthful life in college, till his death at the stake, exhibited such a continued scene of libertinism, perjury, hypocrisy, barbarity, (in burning his fellow-protestants,) profligacy, ingratitude, and rebellion, as is perhaps not to be matched in history." (Part ii. p. 163.) That James I. was right, when he pronounced "the order for morning prayer to be an ill-said mass." (Part ii. p. 159.) That "the communion of Protestants, according to their belief and practice in this country, cannot be more than a feeble excitement to their devotion, and an inefficient help to their sanctification." (Part ii. p. 155.) That Protestants, who are still immersed in the clouds of types and figures, not pretending to any thing more in their sacrament than what the Jews possessed in their ordinances, are comparatively indifferent as to the preparation for receiving it, and, indeed, as to the reception of it at all; while the Catholic supposes the Paschal lamb, the loaves of proposition, and the manna of which Christ speaks, John vi. 52, 58, 59. to be so many promises on the part of God, that he would bestow upon the people the thing signified by them, even that incarnate Deity

who is at once our victim and our food, and who gives spiritual life to the worthy communicants, not in a limited measure, but indefinitely according to each one's preparation." (Part iii. p. 275.) That "it is an absurdity to talk of the Church, or Society of Protestants, because," say you, "the term Protestant expresses nothing positive, much less any union or association among them; it barely signifies one who protests or declares against some other person or persons, thing or things; and in the present instance it signifies those who protest against the Catholic church." (Part ii. p. 124.)

Where, perhaps you will be asked by some of my brethren, lies the absurdity of talking of a church or society of Protestants? Where, permit me to ask you, is the contradiction either in the ideas or the terms? If one term Protestant distinctly and unequivocally expresses one idea, the protestation of those who protest against the Catholic church, how does it follow that another term, be it church or society, does not as unequivocally and as distinctly express another idea, namely, the union or association of those who thus protest among themselves? When you, Sir, have the goodness to assist my dullness, I shall be ready to forgive your positiveness, and to applaud your sagacity.

That "our Divine Master, Christ, in establishing a religion here on earth, to which all the nations of it were invited (Matt. xviii. 19), left some rule or method by which those persons, who sincerely seek for it, may certainly find it:" and that "this rule or method must be secure and never failing, so as not to

be ever liable to lead a rational, sincere inquirer into error, impiety, or immorality of any kind." (Part i. p. 41.) That "during the first five ages of the Christian Church, no less than in the subsequent ages, the unwritten word or tradition was held in equal estimation by her as the written word itself." (Part i. p. 83.) That "the whole right to the Scriptures belongs to the Church; that she has preserved them, that she vouches for them, and she alone, by confronting them, and by the help of tradition, authoritatively explains them; and that hence it is impossible for the real Scripture ever to be against her and her doctrines." (Part i. p. 106.) That "Protestants, in building Scripture, as they do, upon tradition, as a mere human testimony, not as a rule of faith, can only form an act of human faith, that is to say, an opinion of its being inspired; whereas Catholics, believing in the tradition of the Church, as a divine rule, are enabled to believe, and do believe, in the Scriptures as the firm faith, as the certain word of God." (Part i. p. 101.) That "while the most eminent Protestant divines, such as Luther, Melancthon, Hooker, Chillingworth, with Bishops Laud, Taylor, Sheldon, Blandford, and the modern prelates, Marsh and Porteus himself, all acknowledge salvation may be found in the communion of the original Catholic Church, yet no divine of this Church, consistently with the characteristical unity, and the constant doctrines of the holy fathers, and of the Scripture itself (as you profess to have elsewhere demonstrated), can allow that salvation is to be found out of that communion, except

in the case of invincible ignorance." (Part iii. p. 374.) That "Catholic divines and the holy fathers make an express exception in favour of what is termed invincible ignorance; which occurs," as you must intend, Sir, then and then only, "when persons out of the true Church" (by which you mean the Church of Rome) "are sincerely and firmly resolved, in spite of all worldly allurements on one hand, and opposition to the contrary on the other, to enter into it, if they could find it out, and when they use their best endeavours for this purpose:" (Part ii. p. 138.) and consequently, say I, that every Protestant who is not firmly resolved, in spite of all allurements on one hand, and opposition to the contrary on the other, to enter into the true Church, and who does not use his best endeavours for that purpose, is guilty of a "deliberate and formal opposition to the Most High; that he virtually says, I will not believe what thou hast revealed, and thus such wilful infidelity and heresy involve greater guilt than moral frailty." (Part ii. p. 138.) Now the term moral frailty, Sir, which is here selected, you must, upon every principle of consistency, extend to the grossest as well as the slightest violations of morality; and, in point of fact, Sir, nearly all Protestants must be chargeable with such wilful heresy; because, in point of fact, they have not used, nor been conscious of any obligation to use, their best endeavours to find out, among contending theologians, what is that Church which alone deserves to be called the true one. That "no other Church but the Catholic" (by which you mean the Roman Catholic) "can

claim to be a religious guide, because, evidently, she alone is the true Church of Christ." (Part ii. p. 119.) That "the particular motives of credibility, which point out the true Church of Christ, demonstrate this with no less certitude and evidence than the general motives of credibility demonstrate the truth of the Christian religion." (Part ii. p. 120.) That, "were it possible for you to err in following the Catholic method, with such a mass of evidence in its favour, you think you could answer at the judgment seat of eternal truth, with a pious writer of the middle ages," (Hugh of St. Victor) "Lord, if I have been deceived, thou art the author of my error." (Part i. p. 104.) That, "when a Protestant professes to believe in a Catholic Church, in solemn worship, or in private devotion, there never was a more glaring inconsistency or self-condemnation among rational beings." (Part ii. p. 190.) That "the Church of Rome has an exclusive claim to unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity." (Part ii. p. 235.) That "this apostolicity is sufficiently illustrated in that apostolical tree, which you call a mystical tree, the properties of which are explained in Letters 28 and 29;" that "the Catholic Church is the divinely commissioned guardian and interpreter of the word of God in both its parts." (Part iii. p. 371.) That "she alone teaches and enforces the whole doctrine of the Gospel." (Part. iii. p. 372.) That "this Church is the only one which is adapted to the circumstances of mankind in general; the only one which leads to the peace and unity of the Christian Church; and the only one which

affords tranquillity and security to individual Christians during life, and at the trying hour of their dissolution." (Part iii. p. 371.) That "Catholics, if properly interrogated upon the fundamental articles of Christianity, the Unity and Trinity of God, the incarnation and death of Christ, his divinity and atonement for sin by his passion and death, the necessity of baptism, the nature of the blessed Sacrament, will confess their belief in one comprehensive article, namely this,—I believe whatever the holy Catholic Church believes and teaches." (Part ii. pp. 131 and 132.) That, "when any fresh controversy arises in the Church, the fundamental maxims of the Bishops and Popes, to whom it belongs to decide upon it, is, not to consult their own private opinion or interpretation of Scripture, but to inquire what is and ever has been the doctrine of the Church concerning it. Hence their cry is, and ever has been, on such occasions, as well in her councils, as out of them; so we have received, so the universal Church believes; let there be no new doctrine, none but what has been delivered down to us by tradition;" and that "the tradition of which we now treat is not a local but a universal tradition, as widely spread as the Catholic Church itself is, and everywhere found the same." (Part i. p. 98.) That "while religious persecution, which you say is everywhere odious, is not likely much longer to find refuge in the most generous of nations; and while Protestants, whose grand rule and fundamental charter is, that the Scriptures were given by God for every man to interpret them as he judges best, have

no ground for persecuting Christians of any description whatsoever; still it must be remembered that, when Catholic states and princes persecuted Protestants, it was done in favour of an ancient religion, which had been established in their country, perhaps a thousand or fifteen hundred years, and had long preserved the peace, order, and morality of their respective subjects; that any attempt, as they at the same time clearly saw, to alter that religion, would unavoidably produce incalculable disorders and sanguinary contests among them; and that, if they enforced submission to their Church by persecution, they were fully persuaded that there is a divine authority in this Church to decide in all controversies of religion; and that those Christians who refuse to hear her voice, when she pronounces upon them, are obstinate heretics." (Part iii. pp. 368 and 369.) That "God himself attests the truth of this Church by the miracles with which from time to time he illustrates her exclusively." (Part ii. pp. 167 and 170.) That "the miracles ascribed by you to the Apostolical St. Polycarp, and to his disciple St. Irenæus; that the miracles attested by the learned Origen: that the numerous and astonishing miracles wrought by St. Gregory of Neocæsarea; that the miracles recorded in the third century by St. Cyprian, some of which prove the blessed eucharist to be a sacrifice, and the lawfulness of receiving it under one kind; that the numberless miracles recorded by St. Basil, Athanasius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustin, and the other illustrious fathers and Church historians who adorned the

fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries of Christianity; that a great number of miracles wrought in Africa during the episcopacy of Protasius by the relics of St. Stephen; and among the seventy wrought in his own diocese of Hippo, and some of them in his own presence, in the course of two years, three were the restoration of dead bodies to life; that the miracles wrought by St. Austin, of Canterbury, at the end of the sixth century, and faithfully recorded on his tomb;" that such miracles "frequently took place in the Catholic Church, but never among the heretics." (Part ii. p. 170.) "That all the miracles which the illustrious Abbot of St. Bernard, in the twelfth century, mentions of other saints, quite disappear when compared with those wrought by himself, which, for their splendour and publicity, never were exceeded; that the miracles of St. Francis Xavier, the apostle of India and contemporary of Luther, which may in number, splendour, and publicity, vie with St. Bernard's, and consisted in foretelling future events, speaking unknown languages, calming tempests at sea, curing various maladies, and raising the dead to life; that the following century was illustrated by the shining virtues and attested miracles, even to the resurrection of the dead, of St. Francis of Sales, as it was also of those of St. Francis Regis; that, in addition to the above-mentioned miracles performed by the persons to whom you ascribe them, and for the purposes which you assign to them, your Church possesses the miraculous power at the present day; not, indeed, because the members of that Church are able to effect cures, or

other supernatural events at their own pleasure, for even the apostles could not do this; but because the Catholic Church, being always the beloved spouse of Christ, (Rev. xxi. 9.) and continuing at all times to bring forth children of heroical sanctity, God fails not in this any more than in past ages, to illustrate her and them by unquestionable miracles;" (p. 177;) and, finally, that in our own age supernatural cures were experienced, first, by Joseph Lamb, of Eccles, near Manchester, who, on the 12th of August, 1814, fell from a hayrick four yards and a half high, by which accident the spine of his back was supposed to be broken; but, upon the 2nd of October, having gained with difficulty the permission of his father, who was a Protestant, to be carried, with his wife, and two friends, in a cart to Garswood, near Wigan, got himself conveyed to the altar rails of a chapel, where the hand of F. Arrowsmith, one of the Catholic Priests who suffered death at Lancaster for the exercise of his religion in the reign of Charles I. is preserved, and has often caused wonderful cures; and having been signed in that chapel on his back with the sign of the cross by that hand, and feeling a particular sensation and total change in himself as he expressed, exclaimed to his wife, 'Mary, I can walk;' (p. 178.) secondly, by Winefred White, a young woman of Wolverhampton, in 1805, who, having been long afflicted with a curvature of the spine, followed by hemiplegia, performed the acts of devotion which she felt herself called to undertake, and having bathed in the fountain on the 28th of June, 1805, found herself, in one instant of time,

d from all her pains and disabilities, so as to be
e to walk, run, and jump, like any other young
son, and to carry a greater weight with the left
n than she could with the right; thirdly, by Mary
od, now living at Taunton Lodge, who, in 1809,
ing severely wounded her left hand through a
ne of glass, determined, with the approbation of
superior, to have recourse to God through the
ercession of St. Winefred by a Novena, or certain
yers continued during nine days; who accord-
ly put a piece of moss from the saint's well on
arm on the 6th of August, and continued recol-
ting and praying, when, to her great surprise, the
xt morning, she found she could dress herself, put
r arms behind her and to her head, having regained
e use and full strength of it; and who, in short,
s perfectly cured." (Pp. 178, 179.)

Upon the foregoing reproaches, religious tenets,
d statement of miracles, intended to illustrate
at you pronounce to be exclusively the true
urch, I shall not enter into any dispute with you.
ave, however, collected them carefully, because
u place upon them great reliance, because they
e likely to attract the notice, not only of your
man Catholic brethren, but of learned and virtu-
s Protestants, and because I wish your, Sir, the
ll benefit of them, by inducing many readers of
e Gentleman's Magazine to have recourse to
ur book, and dispassionately to weigh the full
rce of your own proofs for your opinions, asser-
ns, and accusations.

The strongest language which I choose to em-

ploy against you is, that, in my serious opinion, Reverend Sir, you have sometimes fallen into error when you contend for doctrines; and that you have often been guilty of uncharitableness when you speak of persons, whether they be living or dead, illustrious or obscure.

Now the chief, though not, indeed, the sole purpose for which I take the liberty of addressing you, is to lay before you another series of passages which struck me very forcibly when I was reading your book, and to subjoin such remarks and such questions as they may suggest to my mind. It is plain, Sir, that you wish to prove not only the efficacy, but the truth of your religion, by the language and the conduct of those who profess it at the hour of death.

Catholics, you say, by adhering to the rule which is formed by tradition united with Scripture, and to the living speaking authority of the church in expounding that rule, live and die in peace and security, as far as regards the truth of their religion. (Part i. p. 104.) Be it so. My concern is with the note you have affixed to the following serious words: "There are few of our Catholic priests," you say, "who have not been frequently called in to receive dying Protestants into the Catholic church, while not a single instance of a Catholic wishing to die in any other communion than his own can be produced. O Death, thou great enlightener! O truth-telling death, how powerful art thou in confuting the blasphemies, and dissipating the prejudices, of the enemies of God's church!"

rt i. p. 77.) My questions upon these words —Can you prove that the Catholic priests, who e been called in to receive dying Protestants the Catholic church, are not few? Can you ve that these many priests have been called in nany Protestants? Can you furnish the public a satisfactory reason that so many priests, a so many instances of conversion, should from e to time have been silent upon the subject of much triumph to Roman Catholics, and so ch mortification to Protestants? Can you show hat the priests professing thus to be called in e men of sound discretion and unimpeachable acity? Was it the prudence of which you speak t restrained your priests from telling their fol-ers, or their opponents, whether their interposi-a was solicited or spontaneous; whether it took ce with or without the consent and knowledge elations; whether the example of the dying was owed by their survivors; whether the persons om they attended were men of weak or strong ellects; and whether, in the general tenour of ir conduct, they were virtuous or vicious; so uous, Sir, as in their last moments to renounce church in which they had been educated, and, h hazard to their reputation, to become mem-s of what they at last believed to be the true urch; or so vicious as to stand in urgent need of se peculiar aids which the Church of Rome ndantly supplies, in the confession and absolu-n prescribed by its discipline?

Your note on the passage which I just now cited

from your book concludes thus: "Some Bishops of the Established Church, for instance, Godman and Cheyney of Gloucester, and Gordon of Glasgow, probably, also, Hallifax of St. Asaph, died Catholics. A long list of titled or other distinguished personages, who have either returned to the Catholic faith, or for the first time embraced it on their death-beds, in modern times, might be named here, if it were prudent to do so." (Part i. p. 77.)

I enquire not, Sir, after the illustrious personages whom your prudence forbids you to name; but my own prudence does not forbid, and my own sense of justice does irresistibly lead me, to express very strong doubts upon the accuracy of your statement as it regards Bishop Hallifax. It was my good fortune, Sir, to know him personally; gladly do I bear witness to his unassuming disposition, and to his courteous manners. When he sat in the professorial chair at Cambridge, the members of that learned University were much delighted with the fluency and clearness of his Latinity, and with his readiness and skill in conducting the disputes of the law schools. It was my own lot to keep under him two acts for my Doctor's degree; and surely, from the preparatory labour which I employed in correcting the language of two Latin Theses, and in accumulating materials for a close logical dispute, likely to pass before a numerous, intelligent, and attentive audience, the obvious inference is, that I did not set a small value on the abilities and acquirements of the professor. I have seen some of his annual speeches at our Cambridge commencement, and,

so far as my judgment goes, they are highly creditable to his erudition and his taste. He acquired much reputation in the University by three sermons which he first preached there, and afterwards published, during a long and important controversy, which had arisen about subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles. He gave no inconsiderable proof of his diligent researches and clear discernment, by an analysis of the Roman law, as compared with the English. He owed much of his fame, and, perhaps, preferment, to the lectures which he delivered at Lincoln's Inn; and whether he and other eminent Protestants be or be not right in considering the Pope as Antichrist, and applying to the Church of Rome many well-known passages in the Apocalypse, no impartial judge will refuse to Bishop Hallifax the tribute of praise for the skilfulness which he shows, in the choice and arrangement of his matter, and in the perspicuity and elegance of his style. He was patronized by a temperate and judicious metropolitan, Dr. Cornwallis; he stood high in the estimation of the celebrated Bishop Warburton; he lived upon terms of the most intimate and confidential friendship with the very ingenious Bishop Hurd; he was respected as a man of learning by his most learned contemporaries in the University; he frequently had access to the sagacious and contemplative recluse, Bishop Law; he, first as a companion, and afterwards as a son-in-law, was intimately connected with the quaint, pompous, but acute and truly critical scholar, Provost Cooke; he was encountered, and

perhaps refuted, but not derided as a puny and clumsy antagonist, by the keen-sighted, strong-armed, high-spirited polemic, Blackall of Emanuel; he was opposed, but not despised, by the dauntless, stately, and fulminating dictator, Bishop Watson; he was a most amiable man in domestic life, and his general conduct as a Christian was blameless, and even exemplary. Let it not be forgotten, too, that, while honoured with the acquaintance of living worthies and living scholars, he felt a manly and generous regard for the memory of the dead. You must yourself, Sir, have heard that he re-published a Charge written by Bishop Butler of Durham, one of the most profound philosophers and most enlightened theologians that ever adorned the Church of England. That Charge, Sir, by some unaccountable misconception in the hearers or readers, had for some time been considered as favourable to the Church of Rome: but the illusion vanished when Bishop Hallifax re-published it, and united with it, what I think, a very judicious preface. Will you pardon me, Sir, for adding that, long before the re-publication, I had myself adopted and avowed the principles upon which Dr. Butler reasoned, and that I felt very great satisfaction from the aid of his arguments, and under the protection of his authority?

To such persons, then, as are acquainted with the events of Bishop Hallifax's life, or the character of his writings, must it not be highly improbable that a prelate, who, upon one occasion, had vindicated the fame of Bishop Butler from the imputation of

Popery, and who, upon another, defended the cause of the Church of England in opposition to the Church of Rome, should in his last moments have renounced the tenets which he had so long professed and so ably maintained?

Between you and myself, Sir, there can be no difference of opinion upon the importance of the fact, which you have deliberately proclaimed to the world. The establishment and the confutation of that fact are alike connected with the honour of Bishop Hallifax, with the feelings of honest Protestants and honest Roman Catholics, and with the general cause both of the Church of England and the Church of Rome. As, therefore, your prudence has permitted you to tell the public that Bishop Hallifax probably died a Catholic, I trust, Sir, that your love of truth, and your sense both of decorum and justice, will induce you to declare explicitly and fully what, in your own mind, were the grounds of such probability.

Upon looking at p. 243 and p. 244, Part iii. of your book, I find that you did not think it inconsistent with your prudence, not merely to resume the subject, but to expatiate upon it, and to omit the qualifying term, 'probably.' After quoting in your text the violent language of "the celebrated City preacher, C. De Coetlogon, who, among similar graces of oratory, had pronounced Popery as calculated only for the meridian of hell," you indignantly ask your correspondent, "Is such the real character of the great body of Christians throughout the world? Were such the clergy, from whom

these modern preachers and writers derive their liturgy, their ritual, their honours, and benefices, and from whom they boast of deriving their orders and mission also? But, after all, do these preachers and writers themselves seriously believe such to be the true character of their Catholic countrymen and the primitive religion? No, Sir, they do not seriously believe it."

Far be it from me, Sir, to say, with Mr. De Coetlogon, that Popery is only fit for the meridian of hell, and a most horrid compound of idolatry, superstition, and blasphemy; be it also as far from me to say, with Dr. Milner, that Bishop Porteus, Bishop Hallifax, Bishop Barrington, Bishop Watson, Bishop Benson, and Bishop Sparke, do not seriously believe the opinions which they have respectively published upon the errors, and what appeared to them the corruptions, of the Church of Rome. Unfeignedly and avowedly am I a well-wisher to the petitions which English and Irish Roman Catholics have presented to Parliament, in order to obtain relief from certain galling restraints and insulting exclusions. But it would very ill become me to rail at the motives, and to scoff at the judgment, of other men, whose views of a complex and weighty question are different from my own. They, I am convinced, seriously believe what, after much reflection, I do not believe, that the success of those petitions would be dangerous to the doctrines, discipline, and usefulness of the Established Church, to the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and to the permanent tranquillity of the State.

Many of the miracles, Sir, which you have recorded in your Second Part, seem to be grossly improbable. But when you proclaim your own belief in them, God forbid that I should presume to arraign the sincerity of that belief, or to deny the rectitude of your intention, when you earnestly recommend them to the belief of your fellow-Romanists.

Deep, Sir, is the concern with which I read your note upon the passage just now quoted from p. 244 of Part iii. "The present writer," say you, "has been informed, on good authority, that one of the Bishops, whose calumnies are here quoted, when he found himself on his death-bed, refused the proffered ministry of the Primate, and expressed a great wish to die a Catholic. When urged to satisfy his conscience, he exclaimed, 'what then will become of my lady and my children?'"

Dr. Milner, on the behalf of that lady, whose sensibility has not been blunted by old age, and who, by her accomplishments and her virtues, is justly endeared to her friends and her children—on behalf of those friends, who most assuredly will sympathize with me in their solicitude to rescue the character of the Bishop from the apostacy which you have imputed to him—on the behalf of those children, who are now respectable members of society, and whose feelings must be most painfully wounded by the representations which you have given of their affectionate father in the trying moments of his death — on behalf of that Church, with the members of which I have lived in commu-

nion from my boyhood to grey hairs, and hope, by the providence of God, to pour forth my latest breath — on behalf of your own Church, which abounds, I am sure, with enlightened and upright men, who would disdain to support the honour of it by misrepresentation — on the behalf of every honest and every pious Christian, whether he be a Protestant or a Romanist—I beseech you to tell the world, unreservedly and distinctly, what is that "authority" which you have deliberately and publicly pronounced "good." Your learning, your eloquence, your well-earned reputation for orthodoxy and zeal — the dignity of your office, and the celebrity of your name, must give more than usual weight to any opinion which you may adopt, and any assertion which you may advance. Again, therefore, do I require you to tell us what is your authority for saying that the Bishop, whose calumnies you have quoted, when he found himself upon his deathbed, must have been struck with shame and compunction, for having mis-employed his talents in giving publicity to those calumnies.

Suffer me now, Sir, to bring forward a third passage, in which you drop all mention of probability and good authority, and speak with equal confidence of Luther, Melancthon, Beza, and Bishop Hallifax. You assume that confidence for the purpose of showing that "certain refractory children in modern ages have ventured to call their true mother a prostitute, and the common father of Christians, the author of their own conversion from paganism, the man of sin, and the very Antichrist.

But they do not really believe what they declare, their object being only to inflame the ignorant multitude." After this double charge of profligate hypocrisy and turbulent malignity, you close a very elaborate letter upon the very momentous question, whether the Pope be Antichrist, in these most remarkable words: "I have sufficient reason to affirm this, when I hear a Luther threatening to unsay all that he had said against the Pope; a Melancthon lamenting that Protestants had renounced him; a Beza negotiating to return to him, and a late Warburtonian lecturer lamenting, on his death-bed, that he could not do the same."—Part iii. p. 326.

Here, Sir, we find your story, not in the notes, but in the text; and a third introduction of it is a decisive proof of the importance which you affix to it. Well, then; you, in the same sentence, speak with the same positiveness of three foreign reformers, who died long ago; and of an English prelate, whose death comparatively may be called recent. Is it possible, Sir, that for the same charge you can in every instance have the same evidence? For your charges against Luther, Melancthon, and Beza, there may be some grounds, either in the histories which you have read of their lives, or in passages which you can select from their writings. But in what genuine work, which bears the name of Hallifax, or in what respectable publication, which professes to give a fair and well-founded account of his faith and practice, do you trace even the slightest vestiges of the thoughts and the words which you have ascribed to him?

Reflect, I beseech you, upon the excruciating and perilous situation in which Dr. Hallifax must have been placed, if your narrative, Sir, be well founded, at that moment when hypocrisy, as Dr. Young says, "drops the mask, and real and apparent are the same." He, from want of conviction, could not find consolation in the Church of England, and from want of fortitude he did not seek it in the Church of Rome. In a man so accustomed, as Bishop Hallifax was, to the study of theology, such a change of sentiment as you have ascribed to him could not be instantaneous. It was not effected by the interposition of any wily casuist, or any proselyte-hunting zealot, who might take advantage of those circumstances which sometimes are found in the death-chamber of the most virtuous and the most devout; and by such circumstances, Sir, I mean fluttering spirits, an impaired understanding, a disturbed imagination, momentary fears succeeded by momentary hopes, one dim and incoherent conception rapidly succeeded by another, and sentences formed imperfectly, or uttered indistinctly. No, Sir, the Bishop of St. Asaph, according to your account, was visited by a Protestant Metropolitan.

Previously, therefore, to his dissolution, while afflicted by sickness and oppressed by age, he must have suffered many a pang from conscious insincerity; and upon the near approach of that dissolution, he was doomed to breathe his last in a disgraceful and dreadful conflict between timidity and piety—between calls upon his prudence, from the praise of men, and upon his conscience, from the

approbation of God—between the impulses of paternal and conjugal affection upon one hand, and of self-preservation upon the other—between the opposite and irreconcileable interests of time to his family, and eternity to his own soul.

To the primate, who proffered his ministry, and to the bishop, who, according to your representation, could not avail himself of it, no appeal can be made, for they are numbered among the dead. But the facts, said to be known by your unnamed informer, could not be wholly unknown to those who were under the same roof with the expiring prelate. Such, I mean, Sir, as personal friends, as near relatives, as chaplains, as domestics, and, perhaps, medical attendants. These men, surely, can bear a direct and decisive testimony to a plain fact. They must have been deeply impressed by such a conversion as you describe. They must have the evidence of their senses whether or no such conversion ever occurred; and, upon the supposition that it did not occur, if such a host of witnesses be set in array, in opposition to your anonymous informer, depend upon it, that the attention of all good men will be strongly attracted by this extraordinary case, that their best sympathies will be roused, and that their decision between the veracity of the accuser and the merits of the accused will be ultimately and completely just. Thus far I have expostulated with you, Sir, upon your charges against a prelate, who, having sunk into the grave, cannot defend himself, and who has been summoned

by his Maker to that tribunal where his guilt or his innocence cannot be unknown.

When such a tale, Sir, as yours is told to the Protestant and Catholic Church,—when it is pointed against such a man as Bishop Hallifax,—when it has been three times produced by such a writer as Dr. Milner,—when it is inserted in a work upon which you seem to have employed the whole strength of your vigorous and well-cultivated mind,—when, if suffered to pass without refutation, it may expose the memory of a learned English Prelate to infamy among Romanists for cowardice, among Protestants for apostacy, and among both for duplicity,—when that infamy, by the wide circulation of a book recommended by your name, may extend to foreign countries, and continue through distant generations,—when your statement may lead to consequences so afflictive to a widow and other surviving relatives, and so alarming to every conscientious and enlightened member of the Church of England; awful indeed, Sir, must be your responsibility unto God and unto man for the truth of your deliberate and reiterated assertions.

Pleased I was, Reverend Sir, with your caution, humility, and candour, when you say, "Far be it from me and every other Catholic to deal damnation on any person in particular!"—Part ii. p. 139. And surely, Sir, with these praiseworthy qualities, as exercised toward your fellow-creatures in the momentous concerns of a world to come, you will not disdain to blend a wary and delicate regard for

the character and honourable interests of individuals in the present world, where you participate with them in the fallibility and infirmities of our common nature.

Equally pleased, Sir, I was with a note to your Address to the very learned and truly exemplary Bishop of St. David's, where you say of yourself, "The writer is far from claiming inerrancy; but he should despise himself if he knowingly published any falsehood, or hesitated to retract any one that he was proved to have fallen into."—Page 3 of Address.

Pardon me, Sir, for telling you, unreservedly, that upon the present occasion your character here, and in some measure your salvation hereafter, are interested in your speedy, honest, and earnest endeavours to redeem the pledge which in the foregoing words you have given to every Christian reader of every denomination.—Page 3 of Address.

It is your bounden duty, Sir, to examine strictly, and to communicate fully, the grounds of that probability which led you to believe, and, believing, to publish, that Bishop Hallifax died a Catholic.

It is your bounden duty to unfold all the circumstances of name and credibility in that informer whose authority you declare to be so good as to warrant you in telling a Protestant public, that a Protestant Bishop, and a distinguished advocate of Protestantism, "when he found himself upon his death-bed, refused the proffered ministry of the Primate, expressing a great wish to die a Catholic; and that, being urged to satisfy his conscience, he

exclaimed, What then will become of my lady and my children?"

It is your bounden duty, without the smallest reservation, and in the most unequivocal terms, to explain the nature and extent of those reasons which you thought sufficient to justify you in affirming, that a late Warburtonian Lecturer, upon his death-bed, lamented that he could not, like a Luther, threaten to unsay all that he had said against the Pope; like a Melancthon, lament that Protestants had renounced him; or, like a Beza, was unable to negotiate, not indeed for returning to the Pope, as Beza may have wished to return, but for announcing to him the conversion of an English Bishop to the Church of Rome.

I trust, Sir, that some notice will be taken of the censure which you have passed upon a distinguished scholar and a dignified ecclesiastic, whom you call "a modern Luther."—Note, part iii. p. 244. Yes, Sir, the very express image, it should seem, of that Luther, whom you have repeatedly and indignantly described as an apostate, a hypocrite, a vacillating and most incorrigible heretic, a clamorous bruiter, an impious ranter, a turbulent citizen, and an infuriate fanatic. This, Sir, is the obvious result of the language which you hold about Martin Luther. And in part ii. p. 162, you explicitly tell us, that he was "the sport of his unbridled passion, pride, resentment, and lust;—that he was turbulent, abusive, and sacrilegious in the highest degree;—that he was the trumpeter of sedition, and even rebellion and desolation;—and, finally, that by his

own account he was the scholar of Satan, in the most important article of his pretended reformation." Here I stand in need of some Aristarchus to assist me in determining whether I am to class the foregoing description of Luther under the scholastic or the epistolary style, according to the distinction which you have laid down in page 344. When you would apply the whole or part of that phraseology to our modern Luther, let me ask yourself, Sir, whether you intend for doctrines only, not for persons the rule, which you prescribed to yourself and to Mr. Brown in your correspondence, where you say, "Let us, in the serious discussions of religion, confine ourselves to language of a defined meaning, leaving vague and tinsel terms to poets and novelists."—Part ii. p. 136.

If the rule in such discussions be not applicable to persons, furnish me, I beseech you, with an intelligible reason for the separation. If it be applicable to them, consider, I again beseech you, the tremendous consequences, when your language about our modern Luther is to be understood with a defined meaning, as the grave charge of a grave theologian, not the vain and tinsel prattle of a visionary poet or a frivolous novelist.

I make no apology to you, Sir, for producing the very offensive passage, in which you have described Dr. Rennell, "one of the candidates for the episcopal bench, from whom it would be in vain to expect more moderation than you have observed in Dr. Porteus, Bishop of London; Dr. Hallifax, Bishop of St. Asaph; Dr. Barrington, Bishop of Dur-

ham; Dr. Watson, Bishop of Llandaff; Dr. Benson, Bishop of Gloucester; Dr. Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester; and Dr. Sparke, Bishop of Ely; and who, while he was content with an inferior dignity, acted and preached as the friend of Catholics; since he has arrived at the verge of the highest dignity, proclaims Popery to be 'idolatry and Antichristianism;' maintaining, as does also the Bishop of Durham, that it is the parent of Atheism and of that antichristian persecution (in France) of which," you add from yourself, "it was exclusively the victim." —Part iii. p. 242 and 243.

"The writer may add, that another of the calumniators here mentioned," *(id est,* the Bishops just now named, Mr. De Coetlogon and Archdeacon Hook), "being desirous of stifling the suspicion of his having written an anonymous No-Popery publication, when first he took part in that cause, addressed himself to the writer in these terms:— 'How can you suspect me of writing against your religion, when you so well know my attachment to it?' In fact, this modern Luther, among other similar concessions, has said this to the writer, 'I sucked in a love for the Catholic religion with my mother's milk.'"—See note, part iii. p. 244.

Dr. Milner, I have not presumed to hold you up to the scorn and abhorrence of Protestants, nor to let loose upon you the hideous appellations of bigoted controvertist, falsifier, calumniator, incendiary, persecutor, a modern Bonner, and an English Malagrida. I have treated you, Sir, with the courtesy which is due to a Roman Catholic dignitary,

who professes to teach the religion of a meek, lowly, and benevolent Redeemer; to have received "in a special manner" (Part ii. p. 216), his legitimate ordination and divine mission in a direct succession from the apostolic age; and to plead the cause of that only true Church which exclusively says claim to unity, to sanctity, to Catholicity, to Apostolicity, and to the visible protection of the Omnipotent in a series of miraculous interpositions, vouchsased for the illustration of that Church through the long space of eighteen centuries. But if the English ecclesiastic, whose private conversation you have confessedly divulged, should in reality not be the contemptible and execrable miscreant which a modern Luther, according to your delineation of his prototype, must be; then, Sir, I leave it with yourself to find a proper name for that writer, who, in the eighteenth century, and in a civilized country, should present to his readers, Catholic or Protestant, such a portraiture as you have exhibited of such an ecclesiastic as Dr. Rennell.

After diligent and impartial inquiry, I acknowledge myself not to be fully convinced that the sacred writers had in view the Bishop of Rome, when they mention the man of sin and son of perdition, that should be revealed, and the Antichrist that should come; nor do I venture to pronounce from the pulpit that the writer of the Apocalypse intended to prefigure the Church of Rome, when he speaks of the woman who was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, who was drunken with the blood of the saints, and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,

with whom all the kings of the earth had committed fornication, and upon whose forehead was a name written, "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots, and Abomination of the Earth."

Of these passages, Sir, I confess that, in the words of St. Austin, quoted by you (Part i. p. 73), "they are among the things in Scripture of which I am ignorant;" or, to adopt the phraseology of St. Peter, I class them with the "things which are hard to be understood." But I do not presume to affirm, or even insinuate, that men, whom it were impudent calumny to call "unstable and unlearned," have "wrested these passages to their own destruction," when, having searched the Scriptures seriously, and with all the aids which history or criticism supply, they were led, by the dictates of their own conscience, to interpret certain well-known texts to the prejudice of the Church of Rome.

The mention of the Apocalypse leads me to remind you of what the writer has said, to readers of all churches and all ages, about that evil spirit who was the accuser of his brethren, and accused them before our God day and night. You and I, Sir, cannot forget that he came down upon the inhabitants of the earth in great wrath, for he knew that his time was short. If, therefore, in the Church of England or the Church of Rome there be any unhappy persons who resemble that accuser in his malignity, it must be the wish of every good man that they may resemble him also in his fall.

The man whom in one place you have arraigned at the bar of the public as a modern Luther, and

whom in another you have virtually accused of inconsistency, insincerity, and corrupt ambition, is now living; and long may he live to be a fellow-labourer with the Maltbys, the Butlers, the Blomfields, and other eminent contemporaries in the cause of literature, to exhort and convince the gainsayers by sound doctrine, and to adorn the revealed will of God our Saviour in all things!

Whether or no he may be pleased to lift up his giant arm in crushing the assailant of his long-established and well-earned reputation, I take not upon myself to determine. But the prudence at which you once hinted ought to have suggested to you, that our modern Luther has a son not quite unworthy of such an illustrious father, not quite unable to wield the choicest weapons of lawful warfare, when confronted by so sturdy and well-disciplined a champion as yourself. My authority, Dr. Milner, is good, not only from common fame, but from the general consent of scholars, and my own personal observations, when I say with equal confidence to Protestants and Romanists, that by profound erudition, by various and extensive knowledge, by a well-formed taste, by keen discernment, by glowing and majectic eloquence, by morals correct without austerity, and by piety fervent without superstition, the son of the Dean of Winchester stands among the brightest luminaries of our national literature and national church.*

* Deeply does the Editor lament, in common with every lover of virtue and learning, that this ornament of the Church

Perhaps, in the progress of his son's improvement, the time will come when the Dean would pardon his contemporaries for saying of himself, as compared with that son,—

> " —— nati spectans bene facta fatetur
> Esse suis majora, et vinci gaudet ab illo."

In respect to myself, Sir, it is impossible for me to foresee what sentiments I may entertain, when " the transitory scene of this world is closing to my sight."—Part ii. p. 236. But, at the present moment, I shall not deprecate from you, Sir, or any human being whatsoever, the imputation of wilful ignorance, when I declare to you what is the state of my own mind after a course of reading not very confined, and of reflection not very negligent, for more than fifty years. I leave you, Sir, to glory in the name of Catholic without impeaching your sincerity. But I am myself " not a Lutheran, not a Calvinist, not a Whitfieldite, nor a Wesleyan, nor of the Kirk of Scotland, nor of the Consistory of Geneva."—Part ii. p. 194. I am a member of that English Church, which, according to your own acknowledgement, " has better pretensions to unity, and the other marks of the true church than any other Protestant society has."—Part ii. p. 125.

The subject upon which I am writing to you is of no ordinary magnitude, and therefore you will

---

no longer exists. Yet it is gratifying to him to reflect, that it must be some consolation to the parents of such a son to read this sincere and disinterested commendation of him from the pen of such a man as Dr. Parr!

excuse me if, at the close of this letter, I accommodate to that subject the solemn language with which your own elaborate work concludes. "On this occasion reflect seriously, and conscientiously, dismissing all worldly respects of whatever kind from your mind; for what will the prejudiced opinion of a rash and incredulous informer avail you at that tribunal where we are all soon to appear?"

I have the honour to be, Sir, with great respect,

Your well-wisher,

and obedient humble servant,

SAMUEL PARR.

June, 1819.

EXTRACTS

FROM A

PAMPHLET PUBLISHED IN 1795,

INTITULED,

"REMARKS ON THE STATEMENT OF DR. CHARLES COMBE,"

A STATEMENT RELATIVE TO THE VARIORUM HORACE,

EDITED BY H. HOMER AND DR. COMBE.

These Extracts are all that could fairly be detached from the immediate subject of the pamphlet. They are referrible chiefly to purposes of self-defence,—to Dr. Parr's share in the Variorum Horace,—to the origin and history of the Preface to Bellendenus,—to the character and labours of Henry Homer, his coadjutor in the publication of Bellenden's tracts,—to the Doctor's Critiques in the Reviews of the day,— and, finally, to several persons of literary and political distinction, whose names were incidentally mentioned. Over the whole pamphlet are liberally scattered observations of great pith and moment, but most of them are too closely involved with the controversial part to be separated ; and that controversial part, by Dr. Parr's desire, is not republished.

EXTRACTS

FROM A

PAMPHLET PUBLISHED IN 1795, BY DR. PARR.

I. PERSONAL.

In the course of an active, and, I hope, not an useless life, I have owed, and I continue to owe, so much of my happiness to the esteem and the gratitude of those whom I have endeavoured to serve, that I am not apt to be ruffled very violently, or galled very severely, by a few straggling instances of ungracious and unmerited treatment. My own spirit is, indeed, too intrepid to recede from my own claims, because they are depreciated by the selfish or slighted by the vain. But my observations upon mankind have been spread through so wide an extent, and exercised upon objects so various, that I have little difficulty in distinguishing between the marks of weakness and guilt in other men—between the effects of temporary situation and habitual principle—between action, which is inconstant, and character, which is more stable. Among those who know me best, I am not exceedingly notorious for professing the regard which I feel not, or dissembling the dislike which I do feel.

My bosom may glow with resentment, but seldom or never rankles with malignity. Upon facts which have passed long ago, and of which no traces have been renewed by impressions from intervening events, or by the anxieties of immediate interest, recollection in me, as in other men, may stand in need of succour from judgment. It will owe something to accident, and something to effort. It will be invigorated by the sudden discovery of facts, and corrected by the careful comparison of circumstances. It will often give occasion for surprize to the mind, on a retrospect of its own operations, both where it fails and where it succeeds. Seldom is it more treacherous than when lulled asleep by the silence of a foe—more helpless than when confused by his obscurity—or more exact than when roused by his contradiction. There are complex cases, in which the understanding gradually exchanges the weaker probability for the stronger; and there are lucky situations, too, in which it pushes at once from the dim and tremulous twilight of uncertainty, to the full and steady brightness of conviction.

Observations such as the foregoing naturally occurred to me, as I reflected on the different state of my own mind at different times, while the transactions between the late Mr. Henry Homer and myself were passing in review before it. I erred, and emerged from error—I advanced from forgetfulness to remembrance, with more or less rapidity—I have been sometimes guided by the clear, and sometimes stimulated even by the imperfect, recollection of

the Pamphlet-writer—I have found occasional assistance from written documents—and at length I am inclined to hope, that where certainty cannot be overtaken in some deep and dark retreat, I may yet be able to explore with advantage the more accessible regions of probability.

It is not very pleasant for me to expatiate upon any faults which have been imputed to me in general terms by an incensed assailant, and of which I do not think myself guilty in the general tenor of my life. Yet I must take the liberty of saying, that I am more addicted to anger than to contempt. True it is, that my conceptions of men and things are vivid, and that my language about them is seldom feeble. But, if my censures are severe, I hope that my commendations are more frequent, and not less forcible. I am sure, too, that I have much oftener had reason to repent of my precipitation in praise, than of my injustice in reproach. Against the babble of conceited sciolists, against the claims of saucy pretenders, against the decisions of pompous, officious, and censorious dogmatists, I do indulge contempt. But if an opponent will vouchsafe to learn from me the art of discrimination, he will, in speaking of my habits, distinguish between the language of contempt, and the language of dissent, of disapprobation, of rooted aversion, of strong indignation.

Smarting under the lash I sometimes brandish against dulness combined with conceit, and ig-

norance hardened with effrontery, blockheads have imputed to me literary pride—insolent and low-minded sciolists have murmured against me for having a churlish temper, when they had themselves insidiously or wantonly, but not with impunity, provoked me—the bigot has spied in me the taint of heresy—the highflyer has clamoured against me, most unjustly, indeed, but loudly, for a leaning towards republicanism. Alii errorem appellant, alii cupiditatem, qui durius spem, odium, pertinaciam, qui gravissime temeritatem, scelus, præter te, Tubero, adhuc nemo.

While the second volume of Janus was with me, Mr. Homer expressed some earnestness for me to return it. I had never read Janus till it was sent me to be marked for the variorum edition; and I did not choose to be precipitate in selecting matter from a book just as new to me, as were some other commentators upon Horace to the variorum editor. Now every man feels his own concerns most closely; and why should not I be permitted to feel mine? It is very well known, both to my pupils and my visitors, that few men are less idle than myself; and by many of my friends it will not be denied, that a pretty considerable share of my time has been allotted to their writings. From my daily avocations as an instructor, from my numerous and I hope useful exertions as a parish-priest, from the variety and extent of my correspondence, from the different affairs about which I am either consulted or employed by dif-

ferent persons in different parts of the kingdom, I am often bereaved of the leisure which would otherwise be dedicated to the prosecution of my studies, the relief of my spirits, and even the preservation of my health. I have occasion to say this now, not for the purpose of praising, but of vindicating myself. I have had occasion to say the same thing before, not only to Mr. Homer, that I might blunt accusation, but to one or two other persons, that I might strike it aside; and they who would not, upon such terms imposed by such necessity, accept my well-meant aid, would have done well to withdraw their requests, not because my industry was slackened, nor because my zeal had cooled, but because their exigencies and my own were, at some unlucky point of time, incompatible.

It would be irksome to me to rush into a war of assertions, even though I should come to the conflict with a panoply of proof. I know that in seasons of irritation even well-meaning men are led to assert more than they can prove, not because they wish to deceive, but because they are themselves deceived—not because they judge uncharitably, but because they comprehend partially—not so much because they mistake their own convenience, as because they are too inattentive to the convenience of other men.

None of the writings which I have hitherto ventured to lay before the public, give the smallest encouragement, directly or indirectly, to theoretical refinements or seditious practices. In my general

habits of thinking, I dread all extremes under all pretences, and in the general tenor of my conversation I am not very forward in recommending sudden and strong experiments. Upon all my political publications I can look back without shame and without compunction. There is one of them,* too, upon which I reflect with peculiar pleasure, because I endeavoured in it to preserve the peace of my neighbourhood, and because my endeavours were not in vain. But if at any future period I should employ my pen upon any political topic, it would be not for inflammatory, but for conciliatory purposes —not to facilitate but to prevent the introduction of Gallic extravagancies—not to promote even a temperate democracy, but to support our limited and constitutional monarchy. Perhaps I have no great confidence in the wisdom of some persons who impose, or in the sincerity of others who are eager to subscribe, political formulas. Placed in an humble situation, and engaged in useful studies, I am content to shew my "faith by my works." Upon the limits that ought to be fixed to the prerogatives of the crown, and the rights of the people, I neither frolic, as many other men do, in newspapers, nor flourish in magazines, nor bluster in pamphlets, nor declaim in sermons. I correspond with no factious incendiaries, I frequent no patriotic meetings; and of the only political society to which I belong, the Duke of Portland, a peer, surely, of indisputable attachment to the cause of royalty, is, I believe, at

* Irenopolis, &c.

this hour an illustrious member. Roused, but not unnerved, by the sound of the distant tempest, I have taken that perilous though honourable station, where the understanding can look around, through a wide survey, on the heavings of the troubled ocean, where the passions, assailed by the force of opposite billows, and reeling for a time under the shock, may recover their just equilibrium, and where hope, rather than principle, may finally suffer shipwreck amidst the fury of the contending elements.

To a man of letters, and a teacher of religion, I am well aware that decorum often becomes an essential part of duty. Knowing, therefore, the force of example, I obey, and encourage others to obey the laws, not for wrath, but for conscience sake. I render "tribute where tribute is due, and honour where honour;" and however I may have asserted my right to approve or disapprove of the measures adopted by a particular administration, I never gave any intelligent and virtuous man the smallest reason to doubt the steadiness of my attachment to the sound and acknowledged principles of our mixed government.

But while I look with dismay and with horror on the poisonous maxims which have been broached in a neighbouring country, I feel no obligation to speak smooth things upon all that is passing at home. I do not confound the French people with the French government. I distinguish between the instruments and the principles of the war. I hold

that the complicated, momentous, and comprehenhensive questions arising from it, are not to be scanned by the hireling retailers of temporary events, or the shallow dupes of imposture, for the moment popular and triumphant. Whatever opinions I may have formed on the ultimate consequences of the disasters by which Europe is now afflicted, and the struggles by which it is agitated, I will not disguise my apprehensions of immediate evils nearly equal, both from the success and the defeat of the confederate powers, for reasons too solemn to be embroidered over a personal altercation with the Pamphlet-writer, and too pure to shrink from the touch of Mr. Burke himself, even if he should wield the spear of Ithuriel. I approved not of the war at its commencement! I rejoice not at its continuance! I cease not to pray most sincerely and most fervently for its speedy and entire termination. I call that man a clumsy reasoner, who, because any foreign potentates have joined our armies in the name of allies, or stipendiaries, would infer that they have ceased to be despots over their own subjects. I pronounce him an atrocious slanderer, who would torture my undisguised scruples as to the irresistible necessity of an Anti-gallican war, into a proof of the slightest propensity towards Gallican theories, Gallican extravagancies, or Gallican enormities. I think him substantially, and, at the present crisis, eminently a good citizen, who mourns, as I do, at the dubious experiments* actually made by some modern loyalists;

* "Fingunt creduntque," are the words of one who looked

and who shudders, as I do, at the baneful innovations theoretically proposed by one very numerous and impetuous class of modern reformers.

Of my philological studies I shall attempt no de-

---

with a piercing eye into the heart of man. And perhaps his remark may be extended to certain political reasons which have been lately adduced in defence of certain perilous measures. But the principle upon which these measures are founded, is not altogether of modern date; and for the sake, not of the unblushing mercenary or the unfeeling ruffian, who profess to act upon it, but of one honourable senator, whom their professions have deluded, I will throw in his way a sentence more plausible and more energetic, than all he has heard in the unmasculine rhetoric of beardless declaimers, or, in what Milton calls the "barking monitories and mementos of any new associates."—*Παρακάλειν τοὺς κινδύνους τοῖς κινδύνοις βοηθήσοντας.* In the application of this maxim to the affairs of our own empire, I, perhaps, am in the number of those who would deny the assumption; or, granting the assumption to be true, I should resist the consequence. But there are men of understandings so besotted, and sensibility so benumbed, that every fallacy, tinged with superstition, and bulky from exaggeration, acts upon them with greater effect than the most simple and adamantine truth. Happy would be that age in which no man could with justice say of his contemporaries, what Milton said very unjustly of a misguided and unfortunate prince: "By so strange a method among the mad multitude is a sudden reputation won of wisdom by wilfulness and subtle shifts, of goodness by multiplying evil, of piety by endeavouring to root out true religion." Milton's Eikonoklastes. But how are we to look for stedfast pillars of the state," instead of such "shaken and uncertain reeds" as too many persons have lately shewn themselves, "while men betake themselves to state affairs with souls so unprincipled in virtue and true generous breeding, that flattery and tyrannous aphorisms appear to them the highest points of wisdom, instilling their barren hearts with a conscientious slavery, if, as I rather

fence, and of my politics I shall scarcely give any other explanation than that they are chiefly drawn from Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, Livy, Sallust, Cicero, and Tacitus, among the antients; and among the moderns, from Grotius, Puffendorf, Barlemaqui, Buchanan, Thuanus, Montesquieu, Helvetius, Locke, Sidney, Harrington, Tyrrill, Selden, Blackstone, and Sir Matthew Hale. He that reads such authors may be excused for his attachment to politics. Little of my time is bestowed on the political pamphlets of the day. But I should think my judgment disgraced if I did not read the political works of six or seven writers, who in our own times do honour to our own country by the depth of their enquiries, the precision of their reasonings, and the splendour of their style. My reading, I believe, is not wholly contemptible, either as to variety or extent, and my leisure is far too scanty for me to waste it upon topics in which I feel no interest, or upon books from which I can derive no instruction. The vigour of my animal spirits, and the love I have for social intercourse, rarely permit me, when I am in company, to sit in sullen silence, or to keep a gloomy and watchful re-

---

think, it be not feigned? And what do they tell us vainly of new opinions, when this very opinion of theirs, that none must be heard but whom they like, is the worst and newest opinion of all others? This is not the liberty which we could hope, that no grievance ever should arise in the state; that let no man in this world expect. But when complaints are freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reformed, then is the utmost bound of civil liberty obtained that wise men can look for."—See Letter to Hartlib, and Oratio Areopagitica.

serve, or to affect that pompous solemnity which some men assume, who wish the copiousness and solidity of their ideas to be estimated in a direct proportion to the paucity and the feebleness of their words. I do not, however, converse upon every subject to which I have attended, before every man with whom I meet; and therefore it may not fall in the way of every man to determine what subjects I think most worthy, or what I think utterly unworthy of my regard.

II. LITERARY.

VARIORUM HORACE.

I marked the Venusinæ Lectiones of Klotzius, Cuningham's Animadversions, Mr. Markland's Explicationes at the end of the Supplices Mulieres, Mr. Wakefield's Observations, published in 1776, and the Animadversions of Waddelus; and the foregoing works appear more or less in both volumes. I marked all Bentley's notes which are produced in the first volume, and all the notes from Janus. To Mr. Homer I pointed out at my own house two notes from Bishop Hare's Scripture Vindicated, and one from his Epistola Critica, all of which are inserted in the first volume of the Variorum Edition, and I in-

formed him of another conjecture in the same Epistle, which is now inserted in the second volume. I lent also to Mr. Homer the second volume of Hare's works, and Pulman's Annotations, which he soon returned to me. I desired him to write out Taylor's observation upon *semper udum*, in Ode xxix. book iii. and I told him of a conjectural reading upon *Caupo*, Sat. i. lib. i. and a judicious interpretation of the word *Eros* in the work De Arte Poëtica, both of which he might find in Taylor's Elements of Civil Law. I desired Mr. Homer to make a reference from *Juvat*, Od. i. book i.; to Bentley's note on *Videar*, or *Videor*, Sat. ii. book ii.; and I am sorry that, after such a reference, the note itself is not brought forward in the second volume. I shewed Mr. Homer a note upon the same word *Juvat* from L. Bos. I gave him a reference to the Adventurer upon *Alite*, in Ode vi. lib. i. a reference to Gray's Works upon *Mobilibus Rivis*, Ode vii. lib. i. which by a little mistake is subjoined to the word *Anio;* a note from Schrader on the word *Undique* in the same Ode, and from Schrader I gave nothing more for the first volume, because his noble emendation of *Pontus*, which he substitutes for *Pœnus*, is noticed by Janus, as may be seen p. 162, vol. i. of the Variorum Edition. But I reserved another emendation from Schrader for the second volume, and have since produced it in The British Critic. Mr. Homer had a reference from me to Toup's note on Longinus, and his Curæ Posteriores ad Theocritum upon the word *Jecur*. I desired him to insert a

note from Barnes's Homer upon Ode ii. line 1, b. i. I told him also of Bentley's conjectures upon ver. 121, of Sat. ii. lib. i. and though I could have referred him to the learned Dr. Foster's work upon Accents, and to the Preface and third book of Cephalas's Anthologia, published at Oxford, yet I had my reasons for desiring him to speak only of Warton's Essay upon Pope; and as the Variorum Edition exhibits the very reference which I recommended to Mr. Homer only, I am inclined to think that he had recorded it either on the margin of his Horace or some loose paper; for, of my detached communications to Mr. Homer, this seems the only one in the second volume of the Variorum Edition. Again, I communicated to Mr. Homer, or to Dr. Combe, or both, the reading of Donatus, "*Exin Tarquinium*," for *Tarquinii Corpus*, in a line of Ennius. I marked for Dr. Combe Bentley's notes on the Epodes and the Carmen Seculare, and I revised the proof sheets. I cleared up two references to Greek passages about which the Doctor was perplexed, and I gave him some advice about using Lambin's notes, and especially those which tended to the illustration of Græcisms.

BELLENDENUS.

I will tell the reader all I remember about the plan and the progress of the new edition of Bellenden. Harry Homer had often heard me speak of the high esteem in which I held Bel-

lenden's work De tribus Luminibus Romanorum, and of the great pains which I had taken to examine how far the charge of plagiarism from that work urged against Dr. Middleton was well founded. My conversation might or might not have excited his curiosity about the name of Bellenden. But I know that he was a diligent searcher after curious books; and soon after he had met with Bellenden's three tracts, he wrote me a good humoured and triumphant letter about his discovery. Whether or no he in that letter gave any intimation of his design to publish those tracts I cannot at this distance of time determine. About the month of October 1786, he came to me at Hatton, bringing with him the book in his pocket, and then he did talk about publishing it. I examined the tracts which I had never seen before—I concurred with him about the propriety of publication; and the result of our different conversations was, that I should assist sometimes in revising the sheets, write a dedication and a preface, and partake of the expence. It was considered by Mr. Homer and myself a common and equal concern. Accordingly, some vowels in Mr. Homer's christian and surname, as well as my own, were subjoined to the dedications. I shewed Mr. Homer, while he was with me, the reference to Cicero's writings in the work De tribus Luminibus Romanorum; and knowing his felicity in chasing what he used to call "catch-words," I desired him to trace out the passages

* A. E. A. O. id. est. Sam. Hen. Parr. Homer.

which Bellenden in the tracts had quoted from Cicero. This I considered as the most laborious and useful part of the task allotted to him. He performed it with great diligence and great success. He applied to me on all points of difficulty, either when he could not find passages, which happened seldom, or when the texts of Bellenden's tracts and Mr. Homer's edition of Cicero were at variance, which was much oftener the case. If, in revising the sheets of Bellenden, my judgment, or my ear, led me to suspect the accuracy of his words, I often compared them with the text of Cicero in my own editions, and sometimes I desired Mr Homer to have recourse to other editions which I possessed not. We entered upon the work, by common consent, from the beginning—we pursued it with joint exertion till the conclusion—and when Mr. Homer, after his return to London, informed me of his unwillingness to trust the book which he had brought from Cambridge to a printer, I agreed to his proposal for taking a share in the expence of having it transcribed. Of the preface itself I will now give a very full explanation; and frequently have I been heard by my friends to declare the satisfaction I felt, that the size to which it at first extended, and the alterations which it afterwards underwent, were so well known to my pupils or visitors, and especially to the Honourable Mr. Augustus Legge, of Christ Church, Oxford; and to the very learned Mr. Maltby, of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

Pleased as I was with the whole design, I wrote the dedications and the preface too before the end

of November. The preface at first filled about a sheet of paper, and contained such information as I had been able to obtain from my books. I desired Mr. Homer to apply to his friends, and I also made similar applications to my own, for the purpose of having such libraries as might contain the tracts consulted, and by degrees I obtained additional information, which I occasionally inserted, as soon as it reached me. Mr. Homer is entitled to great commendation for the diligence of his researches, and to him alone is due the praise of procuring some materials from the British Museum. The preface to Bellenden was written in Mr. Homer's life time—it was published under his immediate inspection—it assumed the form in which it now appears with his knowledge and his consent. Such too was Mr. Homer's delicacy in sharing the praise which he supposed himself not to have earned, that I had some little difficulty in prevailing upon him to let me subjoin the vowels of his name with those of my own in the dedications. But I insisted upon paying this tribute to my auxiliary; and when little controversies had sprung up, and various conjectures had been started about the meaning of these vowels, I took an early opportunity of explaining the fact in a magazine of the very highest celebrity, and of the most extensive circulation. Such were the circumstances in Bellenden's history.

About the end of November, or early in the month of December, my daughter, who was very ill, went with her mother to London, and remained for

a considerable time under the kind and judicious care of Dr. Combe. I suffered great inquietude of mind from the danger in which I supposed her to be. I sought relief and I found it, in preparations for an enlargement of the preface. The political matter was then, for the first time introduced, and of course the preface grew larger and larger as new efforts produced new additions. It was in December first transcribed by Mr. Maltby, now Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, and afterwards in the month of January it was again transcribed by him. In the same month I had an opportunity of shewing it to Mr. Sheridan. It happened to me, as it does to other men of letters engaged in a favourite work—revisal, conversation, and reading supplied fresh ideas, and the size of the preface was in the second transcript much increased before I sent it up to the press about the end of January. While it was printing I revised every sheet twice. I made several corrections in the style, a few alterations in the arrangement, and some addition to the matter. It was published, if I mistake not, about the end of May, or pretty early in the month of June.

In respect to the publication of Bellenden's tracts, the case was this—we entered upon it, according to what I have before stated, as a joint concern. I agreed to pay two guineas for the transcript before the work went to press, and I advanced £50 while it was going on. I submitted to Mr. Homer the whole business of settling for printing, for paper, for engravings, and for the

premiums to be allowed booksellers. From the beginning of the work, to the present moment, I never read one syllable about costs or profit. When the work had been for some time published, it was proposed that I should have no trouble, or further suspense about the issue; that I should consider £50 refunded me, and £50 advanced to me, as the whole of my due, and that all actual or contingent profits arising from the edition should be made over to Mr. Homer himself. These sums, together with the numerous copies I had been permitted to give away, seemed to me a sufficient compensation.

"The original intention of the edition," it is said, "was lost in the reception it met with as a political pamphlet." My memory, which upon literary matters is tolerably faithful, has enabled me to explain in what manner the original intention was changed, or, I should rather say, the original plan was enlarged, with Mr. Homer's entire approbation; and my observation concurs with my memory in preventing me from believing, that this change, or enlargement, was injurious to the sale of Bellenden's tracts. Hitherto I had been accustomed to think that the preface excited some degree of public attention to the work itself, and had gratified a little the curiosity of scholars, not only in England and Scotland, but also in Germany, where I know that Mr. Heyne paid a most honourable tribute of commendation to me for not preferring what Milton calls the "gay rankness* of modern fustianists, to

* Highly as I may be gratified with the approbation of Mr.

the native latinism of Cicero." Into the delusion,

Heyne, I by no means aspire even to the qualified praise bestowed on those writers who are known by the name of Ciceronians. Instead of imitating, as some scholars have professed to do, the manner of Terence or Tacitus among the ancients, or of Lipsius and Strada among the moderns, I have endeavoured, so far as my slender abilities would permit me, to make the style of Cicero a general model for my own; and at the same time I have avowedly followed the example of many learned men in the occasional use of words which are not found in the writers of the Augustan age.—Even in the corrected preface to Bellenden, I have discovered some faults; and I have no hesitation in saying, that I think my own talent for Latin composition very inferior to that of Sir W. Jones, Bishop Lowth, Dr. Philip Barton, Dr. Lawrence, and Sir George Baker.

The mention of the two last scholars in the foregoing paragraph incidentally suggests to me a general observation, which, though it be unconnected with the subject of the present note, I will not deny myself the satisfaction of throwing on my paper. While I allow that peculiar and important advantages arise from the appropriate studies of the three liberal professions, I must confess that, in erudition, in science, and in habits of deep and comprehensive thinking, the pre-eminence in some degree must be assigned to physicians. The propensity which some of them have shewn to scepticism upon religious topics is indeed to be seriously lamented; and it may be satisfactorily explained, I think, upon metaphysical principles, which evince the strength rather than the weakness of the human mind, when contemplating under certain circumstances the multiplicity and energy of physical causes. But I often console myself with reflecting on the sounder opinions of Sir Thomas Browne, Sydenham, Boerhaave, and Hartley, in the days that are past; and of our own times posterity will remember that they were adorned by the virtues, as well as the talents, of a Gregory, a Heberden, a Falconer, and a Percival. It were easy for me to enlarge this catalogue by other instances which the circle of my own friendships would supply.

if it be one, I was in part led, not merely by general report, but by a very witty story which dropped from the mouth of a very witty man, Mr. George Stevens, and which Mr. Homer mentioned to me with bursts of laughter. I have heard indeed, of one noble peer, who, upon looking into the preface, refused to buy the book. But I have also heard of another, and perhaps a more learned peer, who read both with equal attention, and spoke of both in terms of commendation nearly equal. How far my political opinions may have ultimately obstructed the sale of Bellenden's tracts, it is neither for Dr. Combe nor for myself to decide. But if I have not been misinformed, Dr. Combe is mistaken when he says, that "before Mr. Homer's death not many of the original had been sold." The number might indeed at that time fall short of my friend's expectations. But I hope to stand acquitted of all unkindness to his memory, when I think it possible for the sale to have been in some measure retarded by the dearness of the book, and the magnificence of the bindings.

RECAPITULATION.

At first I took the trouble of examining Bellenden's Tracts very carefully, before I advised my friend to hazard the publication.

I gave him proper advice to increase the value of his own edition by references to the works of Cicero, and in all cases of difficulty I assisted to make the text correct.

I undertook the very irksome task of revising some of the proof sheets.

I pulled down my musty books, in order to glean from them such information as they might supply about the life of Bellenden himself, and the progress of his different works.

With all my fondness for the squalid and sapless subtleties of metaphysics, I left them, for once, to try my skill on daintier subjects. Though I could not entirely keep my hands from plucking the thorn with the rose, and weaving them together for some mischievous purpose, yet their chief employment was to cull the gaudiest flowers of rhetoric, and twine them into wreaths of panegyric, which, however, as ——— informs me, soon faded from their own native brightness into a sickly hue, and, shrinking under the blights of public contempt, are now fallen into hopeless decay.

In addition to this prodigality of intellectual labour, I employed my influence, and even lent my money without any prospect of profit.

I trespassed on the politeness of Lord D——, who borrowed for me an original pictnre of Lord North, from which an engraving might be taken.

I gave two guineas for the transcript of a book, which a new edition was soon to bring within my reach for less than half the sum.

I even advanced fifty pounds to defray the expense of printing, paper, and engravings.

REVIEWS.

The reader will, I trust, excuse me, if, for reasons of delicacy, I now take an opportunity to state the whole extent of the share I have ever had in Reviews. To the British Critic I have sent one article, besides those which were written for the Horace. For the Critical Review I have furnished a few materials for two articles only. For the Monthly I have assisted in writing two or three, and the number of those which are entirely my own does not exceed six or seven. In almost all these critiques, my attention was to commend rather than to blame, and the only one in which I ever blamed with severity related to a classical work, the editor of which deserved reproof for the following reasons: He clothed bad critisms in bad latinity. He had not availed himself of that information which preceding editions would have supplied to any intelligent editor. From the stores of other critics he collected very little, and from his own he produced yet less that was valuable. But he had indulged himself in rude and petulant objections against Dr. Bentley; and for this chiefly I censured him. Here ends the catalogue of my crimes hitherto committed in Reviews; and as I now have somewhat more leisure than I formerly enjoyed, it is possible that I may now and then add to their number. My contributions to works of this kind are occasional, and therefore I have no right to the benefit of that se-

crecy, which it may be wise and honourable for the regular conductors of Reviews to preserve. Of the share which I have already taken and may hereafter take in these periodical publications, I never can be ashamed. I might plead the example of many scholars both at home and abroad, far superior to myself in vigour of intellect and extent of erudition; but I wish rather to insist upon the utility of the works themselves, and upon the opportunities which they furnish to men of learning, for rendering some occasional service to the general cause of literature. There is no one Review in this Country but what is conducted with a considerable degree of ability; and though I decline the task of deciding upon their comparative excellence, I have no hesitation in saying that all of them deserve encouragement from learned men. They much oftener assist than retard the circulation of books—they much oftener extend than check the reputation of good books—they rarely prostitute commendation upon such as are notoriously bad. For my part, I am disposed to view with a favourable eye the different opinions and propensities which may be traced in the minds of the different writers. By such collisions of sentiment, truth is brought into fuller view, and a reader finds himself impelled by the very strongest curiosity to examine the reasons upon which men of talents nearly equal have founded decisions totally opposite. By posterity, too, Reviews will be considered as useful repositories of the most splendid passages in the most celebrated works. They will shew the progress of a country

or an age in taste and arts, in refinement of manners, and in the cultivation of science. They mark the gradations of language itself, and the progressive or retrograde motions of the public mind upon the most interesting subjects in ethics, in politics, and religion. Criticism, indeed, is shackled by no party, and devoted to no sect. Let me, however, hope to be excused, if I feel some little predilection for a work which I suppose to be patronized by many distinguished members of the Established Church, and which I know to be in part conducted by a learned man, who was once my own scholar. With sincerity do I say, at the same time, that I harbour no prejudice against the characters, and that I entertain a very high respect for the talents of the gentlemen who are employed in the Critical, the Monthly, the Analytical, and the English Reviews. Among the writers in the three last there are persons whom no enlightened and ingenuous clergyman would blush to call his friend; and, in truth, I think it a circumstance equally advantageous and creditable to myself, that I live upon terms of great intimacy with some of them, and even of confidential intercourse with others.

III. POLITICAL.

"The first mention," says a learned Prelate, "that I remember to have found any where of compact, as the first principle of government, is in the Crito of Plato; where Socrates alleges a tacit agreement between the citizens and the laws as the ground of an obligation, to which he thought himself subject, of implicit obedience even to an unjust sentence. It is remarkable that this fictitious compact, which in modern times hath been made the basis of the unqualified doctrine of resistance, should have been set up by Plato, in the person of Socrates, as the foundation of the opposite doctrine of the passive obedience of the individual."—Bp. Horsley's Sermon, 30th January.

My readers, if they attend not merely to the language, but to the fact and the observation contained in the foregoing passage, may perhaps find a striking resemblance between the Bishop's note on his own Sermon, published in 1793, and Mr. Hume's note on his own Essay, republished 1767. The words of Mr. Hume run thus: "The only passage I meet with in antiquity, where the obligation of obedience to government is ascribed to a promise, is in Plato in Critone; where Socrates refuses to escape from prison, because he had tacitly promised to obey the laws. Thus he builds a Tory consequence of passive obedience on a Whig foundation

of the original contract."—Hume's Essays, vol. i. p. 511.

"It may be difficult," says Bishop Hurd, in his sixth canon upon the Marks of Imitation in Sentiment, "sometimes to determine whether a single sentiment or image be derived or not. But when we see a cluster of them in two writers applied to the same subject, one can hardly doubt that one of them has copied from the other." "Sometimes," says the same illustrious critic, in his third canon on the Marks of derived Expression, "the original expression is not taken, but paraphrased; and the writer disguises himself in a kind of circumlocution. Yet this artifice does not conceal him, especially if some fragments, as it were, of the inventor's phrase are found dispersedly in the imitation."

The two foregoing quotations from Bishop Hurd seem to account very sufficiently for the resemblance between Bishop Horsley and Mr. Hume in their opinions upon the original compact. Now, though I should allow to Mr. Hume that Plato is the oldest writer in antiquity, "where the obligation of obedience to government is ascribed to a promise," I must yet observe, that another antient writer speaks of a compact between the governors and the governed, as existing in times long antecedent to Plato: "Κατ' ἀρκὰς μὲν γὰρ ἅπασα Πόλις Ἑλλὰς ἐβασιλεύετο, πλὴν οὐκ ὥσπερ τὰ βάρβαρα ἔθνη δεσποτικῶς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ νόμους τε καὶ ἐθίσμους πατρίους· καὶ κράτιστος ἦν βασιλεὺς ὁ δικαιότατός τε καὶ νομιμώτατος, καὶ μηδὲν ἐκδιαιτώμενος τῶν πατρίων· δηλοῖ δὲ

καὶ Ὅμηρος, δικασπόλους τε καλῶν τοὺς Βασιλεῖς, καὶ Θεμιστοπόλους· καὶ μέχρι πολλοῦ διέμειναν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς τίσιν αἱ Βασιλείαι διοικούμεναι, καθάπερ ἡ Λακεδαιμονίων· ἀρξαμένων δὲ τίνων ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις πλημμελεῖν, καὶ νόμοις μεν ὀλίγα χρωμένων, ταῖς δ' αὐτῶν γνώμαις τὰ πολλὰ διοικούντων, δυσχέραντες ὅλον τὸ πρᾶγμα οἱ πολλοὶ, κατέλευσαν μὲν τὰς βασιλείας καὶ τὸ πολίτευμα, νόμους δὲ καταστησάμενοι, καὶ ἀρχὰς ἀποδείξαντες, ταύταις ἔχρωντο τῶν πόλεων φυλάκαις."—Vide Dion. Halicarn. Antiq. Roman. lib. v. p. 337, edit. Sylburg.

The words "ῥητοῖς τίσιν" are properly translated "certis conditionibus."

To those who are struck with what Hume shrewdly calls "a Tory consequence of passive obedience built on the Whig foundation of the original contract," it may be amusing to read, from another Greek writer, a passage in which the Whig consequence of limited monarchy rests on the Tory principle of divinity in the monarchical office: "Βασιλεία μὲν γὰρ θεομίματον πρᾶγμα, καὶ δυσφύλακτον ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνας ψυχᾶς· ταχέως γὰρ ὑπὸ τρυφᾶς, καὶ ὕβριος ἀλλάσεται· διόπερ οὐ δεῖ κατὰ πᾶν αὐτᾷ χρέεσθαι, μέχρι δὲ τῶ δυνατῶ καὶ ποτὶ τὰν πολίτειαν χρησίμω."—Vide Hippodamus, in lib. de Republica, quoted in the 41st Sermo of Stobæus.

If, according to the rules of sound criticism, we are permitted to include under the word antiquity the records of sacred as well as profane history, it seems to me that the former is not wholly destitute of instances where the promise to obey, on the part of the people, was connected with a promise to

govern well on the part of the king. Let me hope, therefore, to give no offence to the admirers either of the anti-republican Prelate or the anti-christian Essayist, if I state two cases, which occurred some centuries before the age of Socrates, and to which I shall respectively subjoin the observations of several distinguished commentators. "So all the elders of Israel came to the king to Hebron, and king David made a league with them in Hebron before the Lord, and they anointed David king over Israel."—2 Sam. chap. v. ver. 3.

"Omnis conventio Hebræis Barith vocatur, qualis hæc fuit, quâ David illis indulgentiam anteactorum promisit, ipsi vero regi obedientiam."—Grotius.

"It is not said what the contents of this league or contract was. The Jews think it was principally that there should be an act of oblivion of all the injuries which the people of Israel had done to Judah, or they to them, in the reign of Ishbosheth. But this is too narrow a sense: it is more probable that he assured them that he would govern them justly and kindly, according to the law of God; and they promised to obey him sincerely and faithfully, according to the same law."—Bishop Patrick.

"Fœdus feriit: hoc est, promisit se iis certis legibus imperaturum, nam nullum est pactum aut fœdus sine legibus. Neque enim rex Hebræorum omnibus legibus erat solutus, ut ostendit Guil. Scickardus, in Jure Regio Hebræorum, cap. ii. theorem 7."—Le Clerc.

"And Jehoiada made a covenant between the Lord and the king and the people, that they should

be the Lord's people. Between the King also and the people."—2 Kings, chap. xi. ver. 17.

The comments which follow relate to the latter part of the verse: "Populus promisit regis salutem sibi curæ fore. Ita hic Josephus, Nam ut rex populo quicquam promitterit, moris apud Hebræos non fuit."—Grotius.

"Quo rex promisit se recturum populum cum omni æquitate, et populus juravit se facturum imperata."—Vatablus.

"Quo regi se fore dicto audientem, quemadmodum fuerat majoribus ejus, promisit."—Le Clerc.

"That they should be his obedient subjects, and he should govern them by the law."—Patrick.

On the whole verse Lord Clarendon writes thus: "This could be no other than [a covenant] of protection and justice on his part, and of obedience on their's; however, it makes it evident that kings may covenant with their people, contrary to Mr. Hobbes's doctrine."

I leave the reader to determine between the different opinions of the commentators on the nature of the compact made in both the cases just now cited: and, in respect to the latter, I wish him to observe, that Le Clerc passes over the promise made on the king's part to the people; while Bishop Patrick contends for it, and Lord Clarendon even argues upon it.

As appeals to the writers of antiquity are supposed to be of use even in the discussion of modern politics, I will venture to lengthen this note by a digression from the subject on which I began it.

Blackstone and many other writers quote a well-known passage in Tacitus, as applicable to the mixed government of this country. I would remark, however, that a passage equally pertinent occurs at the beginning of the sixth book of Polybius. After mentioning the three forms of government, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, and expressing his doubts whether preceding writers had considered them as the only or the best forms, he adds, "Δῆλον ὡς ἀρίστην μὲν ἡγητέον πολίτειαν τὴν ἐκ πάντων τῶν προειρημένων ἰδιωμάτων συνέστωσαν." He adduces the Lacedæmonian government as a practical proof of his position; and, if he had known the principles of the English constitution, he would have admitted them as fuller illustrations of his opinion. In the same chapter may be found many judicious distinctions between absolute and limited monarchy, to the latter of which Polybius appropriates the name of kingship. And as his words will, I think, be very acceptable to those who prefer, as I do, kingly government to republicanism, I will produce them:

"Καί τοι οὐδ' ὡς μόνας ταύτας προσδεκτέον· καὶ γὰρ μοναρχικὰς καὶ τυραννικὰς ἤδη· τίνας τεθεάμεθα πολίτειας, αἱ πλεῖστον διαφέρουσαι βασιλείας παραπλήσιον ἔχειν τι ταύτῃ δοκοῦσιν· ᾗ καὶ συμψεύδονται καὶ σύγχρωνται πάντες οἱ μόναρχοι, καθ' ὅσον οἷοί τ' εἰσι τῷ τῆς βασιλείας ὀνόματι."

* * * * * * *

"Οὔτε πάσαν δήπου μοναρχίαν εὐθέως βασιλείαν ῥητέον· ἀλλὰ μόνην τὴν ἐξ ἑκόντων συγχωρουμένῳ, καὶ τῇ γνωμῇ τὸ πλεῖον ᾗ φόβῳ καὶ βίᾳ κυβερνωμένῳ."

* * * * * * *

Ἱρώτῃ μεν ἀκατασκευῶς καὶ φυσικῶς συνίσταται ρχία· τάυτῃ δ' ἕπεται καὶ ἐκ τάυτης γένναται κατασκευὴς καὶ Διορθωσέως Βασιλεία."

vould apply to the government of England, by ; Lords, and Commons, a fine observation h Cicero made, when he probably had in view ıristocratic form tempered with a mixture of lemocratic:

Jt in fidibus, ac tibiis, atque cantu ipso, ac vo- concentus est quidam tenendus ex distinctis , quem immutatum, ac discrepantem aures eru- ferre non possunt, isque concentus ex dissi- rum vocum moderatione concors tamen effici- t congruens: sic ex summis et infimis, et me- nterjectis ordinibus, ut tonis, moderata ratione ıs consensu dissimillimorum concinit, et quæ ıonia a musicis dicitur in cantu, ea est in civi- concordia, arctissimum atque optimum omni in ɔlica vinculum incolumitatis: quæ sine justitia pacto esse potest."—Cicero, Fragment de Re- ca, 584, vol. ii. edit. Gruter.

ith the imagery which Cicero here borrows music, and employs upon politics, the reader compare some passages in lib. iv. cap. 3. and ii. cap. 4. of Aristotle de Republica.

IV. CHARACTERS.

HOMER.

r. Homer received the greater part of his edu- n at Rugby school, under the care of Mr. Bur-

rows. He went thither, as I learn from a letter written to me by his father, at the age of seven. "He continued there seven years, and became the head boy of about sixty." He "afterwards went to Birmingham school, where he remained three years more, under the Rev. Mr. Brailsford."

The celebrity of Rugby school was, in the time of Mr. Burrows, not so great, nor the plan of education pursued in it so elegant and comprehensive, as we have seen them under the auspices of the present very learned master, to whose memory, at some future period, (and for the sake of our youth may it be a distant one!) the inhabitants of this and many neighbouring counties would do well to erect a public monument, recording his eminent merits, and their own well-founded gratitude.* Yet Mr. Burrows possessed, as I am told, a very sound understanding, and a very respectable share of erudition; and the progress which Mr. Homer made under him was such as did no discredit to the abilities of the teacher or the diligence of the scholar. Of Mr. Brailsford's talents as an instructor I cannot speak with precision, though I am warranted in saying that the present master, Mr. Price, who perhaps succeeded him at Birmingham, is a man of a very refined taste, and of learning more than common. But as Mr. Homer had been the "first of sixty boys," before he went to Birmingham school, and as he staid there three years, we may presume that he was for that time employed in reading some of the best classical authors. In November 1768, Mr.

* Dr. James; and this has been done.

:r was admitted of Emanuel College, Cam-
:, under Dr. Farmer, and in that College I saw
ıt a very early period of his academical life.
)leasantry and good sense diffused through his
rsation, the fairness of his character, and per-
:he singularity of his name, attracted my atten-
ınd produced an acquaintance which soon grew
riendship. I will hazard the imputation of ar-
ce, for saying that new incitements were given
industry, and new prospects opened to his cu-
r, by my well-meant advice. Mr. Homer pro-
l regularly to his Bachelor's degree in 1773,
Master's in 1776, and to his Bachelor's in Di-
in 1783. He was elected Fellow of Emanuel
ge in 1778. He had lived in Warwickshire
three years before he became Fellow, and re-
l to the University soon after his election. He
:esided much at Cambridge, where his mind
ıeither dissipated by pleasure nor relaxed by
:ss. He frequently visited the public library,
ras well acquainted with the history or contents
ıny curious books which are noticed only by
ırs. Of the Greek language he was by no
ı ignorant, though he did not profess to be cri-
r skilled in it. He had read many of the Latin
:al authors. He was not accustomed to make
quantities. About orthography he was very
. He was not a stranger to many niceties in
ructure of the Latin tongue. He had turned
tention to several philological books of great
r and high reputation. He was well versed in
)tes subjoined to some of the best editions of

various authors; and of his general erudition the reader will form no unfavourable opinion, after looking at a catalogue of the works in which he was engaged. About Horace he had a fair stock of common knowledge long before he thought of becoming an editor; and as I was well acquainted with his activity, his good sense, and his learning, I looked upon him as a very fit person for undertaking the task of publishing the Variorum Edition. With Mr. Homer I conversed much, and corresponded often about the work, which has lately appeared. He was perspicuous and exact in stating his own questions; and in apprehending my answers he was both ready and correct. He neither dissembled difficulties from vanity, nor slurred them over from laziness. He knew how to adapt docility and firmness to different occasions. His friends he never teased by impotent cavils and futile inquiries. He never attempted to shew off his own powers in that frivolous jargon, or that oracular solemnity which I have now and then observed in persons who prated yesterday as they prate to-day, and will prate again to-morrow, about subjects which they do not understand. Such is my opinion of Mr. Henry Homer. "He, to my knowledge, had fed on the dainties that are bred in a book. He had eaten paper, as it were, and drunk ink. His intellect was replenished."

Mr. Homer, in consequence of some religious scruples (as it afterwards appeared), refused to take priest's orders, when, by the statutes of the founder,

ıe was required to take them, in order to preserve he rank he had attained in College. From a senior ellow he became a junior, and after various negoiations, his fellowship was declared vacant on the 30th of June, 1788. The first intelligence I had of his affair was sent me by a common friend; and ure I am, that no man living could have been more urprised and afflicted than I was upon receiving it. I wrote to Mr. Homer several letters of sympathy nd counsel. I asked about the unknown cause, I leprecated the probable consequences, but to no urpose; for his answers were short and sharp, and vidently were intended to check inquiry, and to ıvert expostulation. When I afterwards saw him n London, I twice resumed the subject, and spoke vith that mixture of delicacy and earnestness which vas adapted to the difficulties of his situation, and he exquisiteness of his feelings. Twice he repelled nd silenced me, by declaring that his conduct was he result of long and serious deliberation, that his nind was made up to all possible inconveniences nd that the interposition of his friends could answer no other purpose than that of irritation.

Knowing that enlightened and amiable men are ıometimes hurried even into rigorous proceedings by their political zeal, I for a long—yes—for a very long time, had painful doubts, whether Mr. Homer had been perfectly well used. But after strict and repeated inquiry, and especially after the sight of a letter which was written to Mr. Homer, Feb. 28, 1787, and the contents of which had neither directly or indirectly been communicated by him to me, and

the original of which was sent me by Mr. Homer, senior, on the 29th of May, 1791, I was convinced, thoroughly convinced, that my friend had met with fair, and, from some quarters, most indulgent treatment; and that, in a case so very notorious, the statutes left no power of mitigation whatsoever in the hands either of the fellows or the master. My prejudices, as a friend, and the scruples of Mr. Homer, sen. as a father, sunk at once under the weight of the clear and authoritative evidence which that letter conveyed. Mr. Homer, I saw, persisted in obeying the dictates of his conscience, and the members of the College were compelled to act under the direction of their statutes, and by the force of their oaths.

FARMER.—Of any undue partiality towards the Master of the College, I shall not be suspected by those persons who know how little his sentiments accord with my own, upon some ecclesiastical, and many political matters. From rooted principle and antient habit he is a Tory; I am a Whig; and we have both of us too much confidence in each other, and too much respect for ourselves, to dissemble what we think upon any grounds, or to any extent. Let me then do him the justice which, amidst all our differences in opinion, I am convinced that he will ever be ready to do me. His knowledge is various, extensive, and recondite. With much seeming negligence, and perhaps, in later years, some real relaxation, he understands more, and remembers more, about common and uncommon subjects of literature, than many of those who would be

thought to read all the day, and meditate half the night. In quickness of apprehension, and acuteness of discrimination, I have not often seen his equal. Through many a convivial hour have I been charmed by his vivacity, and upon his genius I have reflected in many a serious moment with pleasure, with admiration, but not without regret, that he has never concentrated and exerted all the great powers of his mind in some great work, upon some great subject. Of his liberality in patronizing learned men, and of his zeal in promoting learned publications, I could point out numerous instances. Without the smallest propensities to avarice, he possesses a large income; and without the mean submissions of dependence he has risen to high station. His ambition, if he has any, is without insolence; his munificence is without ostentation; his wit is without acrimony; and his learning is without pedantry.

BENNET.—Among the fellows of Emanuel College who endeavoured to shake Mr. Homer's resolution, and to preserve for him his academical rank, there was one man, whom I cannot remember without feeling that all my inclination to commend, and all my talents for commendation, are disproportionate to his merit. From habits not only of close intimacy, but of early and uninterrupted friendship, I can say there is scarcely one Greek or Roman author of eminence, in verse or prose, whose writings are not familiar to him. He is equally successful in combating the difficulties of the most obscure, and catching at a glance the beauties of the

most elegant. Though I could mention two or three persons who have made a greater proficiency than my friend in philological learning, yet, after surveying all the intellectual endowments of all my literary acquaintance, I cannot name the man whose taste seems to me more correct and more pure, or whose judgment upon any composition in Greek, Latin, or English, would carry with it higher authority to my mind.

To those discourses which, when delivered before an academical audience, captivated the young, and interested the old, which were argumentative without formality and brilliant without gaudiness, and in which the happiest selection of topics was united with the most luminous arrangement of matter, it cannot be unsafe for me to pay the tribute of my praise, because every hearer was an admirer, and every admirer will be a witness. As a tutor, he was unwearied in the instruction, liberal in the government, and anxious for the welfare of all who were entrusted to his care. The brilliancy of his conversation, and the suavity of his manners, were the more endearing, because they were united with qualities of a higher order, because in morals he was correct without moroseness, and because in religion he was serious without bigotry. From the retirement of a college, he stepped at once into the circle of a court. But he has not been dazzled by its glare, nor tainted by its corruption. As a prelate, he does honour to the gratitude of a patron who was once his pupil, and to the dignity of a station where, in his wise and honest judgment upon things, great

duties are connected with great emoluments. If, from general description, I were permitted to descend to particular detail, I should say, that in one instance he exhibited a noble proof of generosity, by refusing to accept the legal and customary profits of his office from a peasantry bending down under the weight of indigence and exaction. I should say, that, upon another occasion, he did not suffer himself to be irritated by perverse and audacious opposition; but, blending mercy with justice, spared a misguided father for the sake of a distressed dependent family, and provided, at the same time, for the instruction of a large and populous parish without pushing to extremes his episcopal rights when invaded, and his episcopal power when defied. While the English Universities produce such scholars, they will indeed deserve to be considered as the nurseries of learning and virtue. While the Church of Ireland is adorned by such prelates, it cannot have much to fear from that spirit of restless discontent, and excessive refinement, which has lately gone abroad. It will be instrumental to the best purposes by the best means. It will gain fresh security and fresh lustre from the support of wise and good men. It will promote the noblest interests of society, and uphold, in this day of peril, the sacred cause of true religion.

Sweet is the refreshment afforded to my soul by the remembrance of such a scholar, such a man, and such a friend, as Dr. William Bennet, Bishop of Cork; and happy am I, that, before my return to the Variorum Editor, my best feelings will have the

most exquisite gratification from another fact, which I am now preparing to lay before the reader.

Though I collected from the general conversation of Mr. Homer that he was not adverse to a partial and temperate reform in the Church of England, yet in no one moment of the most private and confidential intercourse did he open to me his doubts upon any particular subject of doctrine. When I was talking to him about the events which had recently passed in college, he for the first time told me, that many years before he had stood aloof from some preferment, which, in all probability, was within his reach, and that he had taken an unalterable resolution of not accepting any living, either from private patrons or from an academical society. The reasons upon which this resolution was founded he did not reveal to me, nor did I think myself authorized to investigate them. But I ever have honoured, and ever shall honour, so much moderation, mixed with so much firmness. He never indulged himself in pouring forth vague and trite declamations against the real or supposed errors of churchmen. He never let loose contemptuous and bitter reproaches against those who might differ from him upon speculative and controversial topics of theology. He remained a quiet, and, I doubt not, a sincere conformist within the pale of the Establishment, after renouncing all share of its profits, and all chance of its honours. On this rare and happy union of integrity and delicacy, panegyric were useless. They who read of his conduct will approve of it, and, among those who approve,

some wise and virtuous men may be found, whom his example may encourage to imitate. In praising Mr. Homer, I mean not, however, to censure some enlightened and worthy contemporaries, who, from motives equally pure, may have not pursued the same measures. The propriety of continuing in the church, as he continued, will depend upon personal circumstances, which will be different with different men, and upon general principles, about which the best scholars and the best Christians of this age are not wholly agreed.

Mr. Homer, I remember, soon after the appearance of Mr. Burke's first book about the French Revolution, spoke of it to me in strong language of disapprobation. Later events may have increased that disapprobation; and though I am confident that they would not have diverted me from my original purpose, I will not answer for the degree of effect they might have produced on the mind of Mr. Homer. I have little difficulty in deciding what would have been his opinion upon the causes which have lately divided the political parties in this kingdom, and yet I think so highly of his good sense and his candour, as to believe that he would have distinguished between the literary and political characters of the two eminent persons to whom I wished, and persist in wishing, the work to have been dedicated.

From the quickness of Mr. Homer's temper, and perhaps of my own, we now and then wrangled in

our conversation and in our letters. But the effects of these little altercations were temporary; and at a time when, like the present, I am called upon to defend my conduct in private life before a public tribunal, I feel the very highest and purest satisfaction in being able to affirm, that, from the commencement of my acquaintance with Mr. Homer, to the very latest hour of his life, we never had one serious dispute—one difference which sent us with throbbing bosoms to a restless pillow for one night, or darkened our countenances with one frown upon the succeeding day. Many and great were his exertions in compliance with my requests, and for the management of my concerns. Many, too, are the thanks I returned to him, and many the services I endeavoured to render him. But if his affairs were perplexed, I knew it not; if his mind was hurt in an unusual degree by any instance of my misconduct, I knew it not. If his disease was aggravated by my behaviour to him, I knew it not. No such complaints were made by him to me; and, when they were made by others after his death, I was shocked at the imputation of crimes which I never meant to commit.

Mr. Homer, in his last illness, had been for three or four weeks with his father in Warwickshire before I knew that he was ill. I heard, indeed, in a promiscuous conversation, that a son of Mr. Homer was ill at his house, and I supposed it to be another son. But on the very day after the evening I had found that son to be my friend, I sent a special messenger with a letter full of anxious and affectionate inquiry, and I received an answer which I

clasped to my bosom, and which I at this moment keep deposited among the most precious records of friendship. In a day or two I hastened in person to the father's house. With anguish of soul, I found Harry pale, emaciated, and sunk beyond the power of recovery. I talked to him with all the tenderness which the sight of such a friend, in such a situation, could have excited in the most virtuous breast. I came away with a drooping head, and with spirits quite darkened by the gloom of despair. Again I hastened to see him, while the lamp of life should not be wholly gone out; and again I did see him on the evening before his eyes were closed in death. With tears, not easily stifled, and with an aching heart, I accompanied his sad remains to the grave; and in many a pensive mood have I since reflected upon the melancholy scene. Many a look of fondness have I cast upon his countenance, which meets me in an excellent engraving as I enter my study each revolving day. Many an earnest wish have I formed, that my own last end may be like his, a season of calm resignation, of humble hope, and of devotion, at once rational, fervent, and sincere.

Within a few days after the funeral, there passed an honourable and unfeigned reconciliation between his very amiable and accomplished brother and myself. In the letters which I had occasion to write to several persons who knew me, I spoke of his virtues, of his services, and of the heavy loss which was sustained by those who were near and dear to him.

In the course of my correspondence with Mr.

Homer's father, I received one letter which surprised, and, indeed, provoked me; for I found myself accused of having created unnecessary delays in a work to which I really had been giving assistance without any expectation of profit or reward —accused of injuring my friend's health, when in truth I had not known it to be in danger—accused of adding to the load of distresses, which were equally uuknown to me, with the embarrassments from which they proceeded. Conscious as I was of loving Harry, of having been served by him, of wishing and endeavouring to serve him, I undoubtedly, at such a crisis, took offence at such a letter. I wrote in my own justification to Dr. Combe. I wrote also to Mr. Homer's father very fully and very firmly in my own defence.

With Dr. Combe the altercation soon ceased, and I revised all the proof-sheets which he sent me.

Upon examining, as I did lately, the subsequent letters which I received from Mr. Homer's father, I find that, in his estimation at least, I was contriving all possible means for the success of the Variorum Edition Let me not be charged with any intention of throwing, at this distance of time, the smallest blame upon Mr. Homer's father. Great allowances were due to his situation and his feelings, and great praise do I owe him for the spirit in which he received my angry answer to his angry letter. From motives of delicacy to him, I will not produce the accusations which I endeavoured to repel. But from his subsequent letters I might bring forward several expressions, which do honour to his judg-

ment and candour, and which carry with them decisive proofs of his confidence in my readiness to go on with the work which his son had not lived to complete.

Mr. Homer was engaged with me in the republication of Bellenden's Tracts in the year 1787. I give a list of his other works from a paper obligingly communicated to me by his late father. "About the year 1787 he published three books of Livy, viz. first, twenty-fifth, and thirty-first, ex editione Drackenborchii, cum notis ejusdem selectis. His accedunt Dissertationes pauculæ Creverii atque aliorum, cum Chronologia Car. Sigonii. Soon after followed the two small tracts of Tacitus's Germania et Agricola, ex edit. Gab. Brotier ad alteram Joh. Aug. Ernesti collata 1788.

"Tractatus varii Latini a Crevier, Brotier, Auger, &c. 1788.

"Ovid's Epistles, ex editione Burman. 1789.

"Sallust. ex editione Cortii, 1789.

"Pliny, ex editione Cortii et Longolii, 1790.

"Cæsar, ex edit. Oudendorp. 1790.

"Persius, ex edit. Heninii.

"Tacitus, ex edit. Brotier, complete all but the Index.

"Livy, ex edit. Drackenb. in the press.

"Quintilian, ex edit. Burman. ditto.

He also intended to publish Quintus Curtius, but no steps were taken towards it. Dr. Combe says, the types and paper speak for themselves."

I have given the foregoing catalogue in the

words of Mr. Homer, senior, as I find them in a letter dated May 24th, 1791. I did not know till after my friend's death, that his actual or intended publications were so numerous. In a letter of Mr. Homer, senior, dated the 16th of June 1791, it is said, "that little less than a thousand pounds would be necessary to complete the index to Tacitus, the Horace, the Livy, and the Quintilian." How far my friend had proceeded in any one of these unfinished works but the Horace, I knew not. I once saw a part of the index intended for Tacitus lying on a table in his father's house.

In 1788 Mr. Homer published, C. Cornel. Tacit. de Moribus Germanorum et de Vita Agricolæ, ex editione Gabrielis Brotier, ad alteram Joh. Aug. Ernesti, collata; and in 1789 he published, C. C. Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus, ex editione Gabrielis Brotier, ad alteram Joh. Aug. Ernest. collatus. Accesserunt Supplementum Dialogi G. Brotier, et brevis Summa Præceptorum de Arte dicendi ex tribus Ciceronis libris de Oratore collecta a Jasone de Nores. I mention this to shew the respect which he had for J. de Nores: he found this tract bound up with J. de Nores on the Art of Poetry, published at Venice 1553. Subjoined to it is Tripolini Gabrielli de Spherica Notione ex Macrobio et Plinio brevis et distincta tractatio. This, too, was republished, with the preceding works just now mentioned, by Mr. Homer, in 1789, though he has not, in the title page, noticed it.

With three exceptions only, H. H. had a larger share of my confidence than any other human being; and in him I know it to have been deservedly and wisely placed. My intercourse with Dr. C. was less unreserved, and less important. But I always valued his friendship, because I was always convinced of his sincerity.

Nearly eight months after this pamphlet had been sent to the printer, I received the melancholy news that one of the three persons to whom I have above alluded is no more. It was Sir William Jones. For the sake of learning and virtue, I will apply to him, with a few alterations, what Plato said of Socrates: *Ἡ δὲ ἡ τελευτὴ τοῦ ἑταίρου ἡμιν εγένετο, ἄνδρος, ὡς ἡμεις φαίμεν ἂν, πάντων ὧν ἐπειράθημεν, πολυμαθεστάτου, καὶ μάλιστα καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ.*

Spirit of Henry Homer, rest in peace! Among the unforeseen and unmerited evils from which the hand of death has delivered thee, let it not be considered as the least, that thou wast not doomed to behold the disastrous day, when principles maintained by thee in common with one of thy oldest and dearest friends were stretched upon the rack, by a self-appointed inquisitor, and commanded to make confession of unaccomplished, unattempted, unthought of crimes, as the only condition of being absolved from the heavier charges of rebellion—anarchy—murder—atheism.

COMBE.

Dr. Combe has long had, and still retains, a large share of my esteem for his intellectual endowments, and moral excellencies. To his veracity I studiously have paid, and shall continue to pay, great and unfeigned respect. We do, indeed, differ from each other, sometimes upon matters of recollection and opinion, and sometimes in opportunities for information. But to whatever extent this difference may reach, I desire that it may be imputed to precipitation upon his part—not cunning—to involuntary misrepresentation, not deliberate falsehood—to soreness in the editor, not malevolence in the man. I am disposed even to praise him for the quickness of feeling, and stoutness of spirit, which may have induced him to stand forth in the defence of his reputation, where he thought himself aggrieved. I forgive him, after a few struggles, for the severity with which he has buffeted my own. To find by experience that friendships are mortal, is the hard but inevitable lot of fallible and imperfect men. But it always has been, and always will be, one of the first wishes of my heart, and one of my first prayers to Heaven, that no enmity of mine may ever be immortal.

BURKE, WINDHAM, FOX, PITT.

Large as may be the space which political subjects occupy in my mind, strong as are my attach-

ments and aversions to political men, and warm as are my approbation and disapprobation of political measures, I am not inattentive to other, and, perhaps, higher considerations. It is not my fortune to coincide in opinion with Mr. Burke and Mr. Windham upon some of the steps that have lately been taken, and some of the doctrines that have lately been disseminated in this country. But have I forgotten the indisputable and distinguished merits of these great men upon former occasions? or, am I authorised to refuse them the praise of upright intention in their present conduct? Far from it. I yet remember, that Mr. Windham is an acute disputant, an accomplished scholar, a polished gentleman, and a senator of whom I have hoped, that he would be, like Abdiel, "among the faithless faithful found." In Mr. Burke, I have not lost sight of his splendid eloquence, of his numerous and celebrated writings, of knowledge so various and so comprehensive, that imagination cannot assign its limits; and of genius more vigorous, more versatile, and more elevated, than at this day can be found among the enlightened inhabitants of the British empire, and, I had almost said, in the whole circle of the human race.

What I thought of Mr. Fox has been elsewhere stated, and I continue to think the same with increased conviction. Great as may be my admiration of that man, when surveyed on the theatre of his talents, it falls very short of the affection and the reverence which I feel when I contemplate the nobler parts of his character in the sanctuary of his

virtues. Of him I have said in a Dedication what to the latest hour of my life I shall repeat and avow, and what I am prepared to defend amidst the dissolution of public parties, the fluctuations of public opinion, and the shocks of public events. But if a friend, even of Mr. Pitt, were to ask me for a dedication, I should disdain, from political motives, to refuse compliance. Without offering the smallest violence to my own settled principles, I should endeavour to gratify the warm, and, it may be, the honourable prejudices of Mr. Pitt's adherent. In the wide range of that minister's attainments, talents, and even measures, I should not very long be at a loss for topics of commendation, at once appropriate and just. I should select those topics with impartiality, I should seize them with eagerness, I should exhibit them with all the advantages of amplification and arrangement, with all the embellishments of diction, and all the ardour of panegyric, which my understanding and my erudition, such as they are, would enable me to employ.

MANSFIELD.

As Dr. Combe, in a letter to me, had endeavoured to justify the motto, [to the Variorum Horace] by saying that the words "virtutis veræ custos" stand before the line to which I objected, he might think it unnecessary, or find it rather difficult, to attempt any farther vindication of his judgment, either in bringing together two passages which are so

remote from each other in Horace, or in applying to Lord Mansfield the second passage, which, for reasons stated in the review, I should have been unwilling to apply to any person whom I respected. I observe, however, with great satisfaction, that the Doctor allows me to have communicated my objection to the motto long before the publication of the Horace, and upon this circumstance I rest my defence against the charge of "sly and insidious detraction."

Whether my real opinion of Lord Mansfield be equally favourable with that of Dr. Combe is not a subject for immediate discussion. But whence, I would ask, can any reader of the British Critic collect that it is unfavourable. Not surely from the review, for I there admit the greater part even of Dr. ——'s panegyric to be well founded. I speak of Lord Mansfield's venerable name. I disclaim for myself the invidious application of the remaining words in Horace to Lord Mansfield. I say only, and I say truly, that prejudiced or mischievous persons are to be found, who will make that application. This surely is harmless and decorous, for, great as my veneration is for the intellectual powers and professional merit of Lord Mansfield, I know, and am now forced to confess, that other parts of his character are not equally brilliant. Must then my hatred be inferred from the circumstance of my having communicated my objections to Dr. —— in the course of our correspondence? Surely this is a perverse inference. Surely I was doing for Lord Mansfield what a friend would wish me to do. Surely, if I felt any emotions of dislike towards the

noble Lord, I suppressed them at the moment, from the regard I bore to the credit of Dr. ——'s taste and the warmth of his attachment. Surely I was in effect excluding myself and all other men from exercising "a talent for sly and insidious detraction," when I desired Dr. —— not to make use of a motto which, in the mind of every scholar, must be associated with the remembrance of the occasion upon which Horace had written the words in question, and which might furnish opportunities for calumny to those, who may have heard of Lord Mansfield what I myself have heard, and may believe to his disadvantage more than I believe.

PORSON.

Mr. Porson, the re-publisher of Heyne's Virgil, is a giant in literature, a prodigy in intellect, a critic, whose mighty achievements leave imitation panting at a distance behind them, and whose stupendous powers strike down all the restless and aspiring suggestions of rivalry into silent admiration and passive awe. He that excels in great things, so as not to be himself excelled, shall readily have pardon from me, if he errs in little matters better adapted to little minds. But I should expect to see the indignant shades of Bentley, Hemsterhuis, and Valckenaer rise from their grave, and rescue their illustrious successor from the grasp of his persecutors, if any attempt were made to immolate him on the altars of dulness and avarice, for his sins of omission, or his

sins of commission, as a corrector of the press. Enough, and more than enough, have I have heard of his little oversights, in the hum of those busy inspectors who peep and pry after one class of defects only, in the prattle of finical collectors, and the cavils of unlearned and half-learned gossips. But I know that spots of this kind are lost in the splendour of this great man's excellencies. I know that his character towers far above the reach of such puny objectors. I think that his claims to public veneration are too vast to be measured by their short and crooked rules, too massy to be lifted by their feeble efforts, and even too sacred to be touched by their unhallowed hands.

HALLIFAX.

The piety of Dr. Hallifax I have never depreciated. The learning of Dr. Hallifax I have more than once commended, and in truth I have had more opportunities for judging of both, than may have fallen to the lot of the Variorum Editor. But if Dr. Hallifax had really joined the learning of even Archbishops Potter and Usher to the piety of Bishops Beveridge and Berkeley, still I should think myself warranted in saying all I have said of a prelate who had spoken in such degrading terms of such a valuable writer as Dr. Lardner. To my weak understanding and groveling spirit, it does not seem the best method for supporting the general interests of literature and religion, that one scholar should speak thus of another,

not upon a doubtful and unimportant subject of taste or criticism, but upon the merit of a work intended, like that of Lardner, to uphold the common cause of Christianity against a vigilant and active confederacy of common foes. Where Dr. Combe spoke of "Jani industria," his meaning was not so clear as it might have been easily made. But when Dr. Hallifax called Dr. Lardner "laborious," every man of discernment knew his meaning,* and few men

* By a trifling mistake I said industrious.—Long before the Variorum Edition I knew the appropriate sense of the Latin word industria, as distinguished from diligentia. But from the want of epithets or words nearly synonymous, in the Preface to the Variorum Edition, and from other circumstances which I will not enumerate, I had my doubts concerning the precise extent of Dr. C.'s commendation; and as the edition of Janus marked by myself had been of great use to the first volume of the Variorum Edition I wished to see terms of approbation more full, and upon this occasion more unequivocal.—When Varro commended the industry of Ælius, he also professed "Ælii ingenium non reprehendere"—see A. Gell. lib. i. cap. 18. When Muretus applied "pleraque omnia integra" to the industry of Canter, whom he supposed to be preparing an edition of Athenæus, he took care to prevent any misconception of his own meaning, by calling Canter, "hominum eruditissimum qui studium in Athenæo emendando posuisset, cumque a se Latine incredibili felicitate redditum brevi editurus esset." Vid. Mureti Var. Lect. cap. 2. lib. xviii.—But Dr. C. is less copious in the description, and less warm in the commendation of the industrious Janus; and as to the complimentary epithet "celeberrimus," no stress can be laid upon a term, which critics use of each other as a title of course, and which they rarely omit, even where they are confuting and deriding their brethren of the craft.—If I were not scared at the charge of introducing republican simplicity into the regions of philology, I should almost venture to adopt and recommend the following sentiment

of delicacy and impartiality will be found to defend it.

Now if Dr. Combe should not have chanced to turn his attention to the theological writings of both these Doctors, he can hardly be considered as a competent judge in a case where he has appeared as a vehement accuser. In reality, it is not so much for an editor of Horace, as for theological readers who know the "signs of the times and the seasons," to decide upon the dangerous tendency of such fastidious expressions issuing from authors placed in such high stations. When Dr. Combe calls Dr. Hallifax a learned and a pious bishop, I assent to the justness of the epithets, and yet I am disposed to consider

---

of Heyne.—Nominibus Virorum doctorum, quos commemoravi, imprimis vita defunctorum, nolui ubique adjicere honoris causa, Vir. Cl. aut quo nunc se mutuo honore compellant, Vir. Ill. Totum hunc morem facetum, seu verius ineptum, quo cædimus, et totidem plagis consumimus hostem, utinam sublatum esse vellet ætas nostra. Non ex loco et ordine et diginitate, verum ex ingenio, doctrina et meritis viri litterati censendi sunt. Vid. Pag. xix. Præfat. ad Nov. edition. Heynii Virgil. The authority of Heyne may not be sufficient to produce any alteration in the practice of those critics, whom the late Dr. George, of Eton, ludicrously calls the "Panuity." Yet I shall endeavour to give farther protection to my own opinion by the words of Morcellus: "Nec bene litterati viri, quod nunc vulgo fit, viri clarissimi vocantur, quum ea formula veteres dignitatem virorum, non doctrinam designarent: itaque senatores potissimum sic audierunt; eaque de caussa quum eo titulo Præfecti Prætorio carerent, quod ex equestri ordine creabantur," "Severus Alexander Senatoriam," inquit Lampridius, "his addidit dignitatem, ut viri clarissimi et essent et dicerentur."—V. Morcellum de Stilo Inscript. Latin. p. 444.

the doctor as speaking not from any direct knowledge of the bishop's publications, but upon the authority of general report, and in conformity to that language of courtesy which I hope to see prevailing in this country more and more. Among the good effects arising from the disasters and the crimes of a neighbouring kingdom, this I believe is not the least, that clergymen and bishops are now mentioned with less scorn and levity than they used to be, by those persons who have at last discovered the connection that subsists between the influence of religious teachers, and the belief of religion itself, between religion and the practice of morality, between morality and the dearest interests of society. Upon topics of polite literature, and in cases of personal provocation, allowances may be made for the harsh language of clergymen—but when they are writing on the momentous concerns of religion, they cannot more effectually secure the respect of laymen than by speaking of each other's well-meant labours without disrespect. On this subject I have delivered my opinions in two former publications, and I see no reason for changing them.

While Dr. Hallifax was living, I re-published the Warburtonian tracts. In the dedication I said (p. 155): "What Bishop Hallifax really is in the republic of learning it can be no disgrace for any other scholar to be." In the preface, p. 189, I had occasion to make the same allusion which I made in the review, to the same epithet "laborious;" and in both places I was led to make it by an asso-

ciation which is natural enough among men of letters, and by motives which I shall never be afraid to avow.

DR. MARTYN AND DR. SHAW.

In regard to Botany itself, I cannot hold in contempt that science which I know to be cultivated by a man endowed with such elegance of taste and soundness of understanding, and furnished with such stores of antient and modern learning, as Mr. Professor Martyn. I have myself lately been instrumental in procuring from the Cambridge press the publication of a work which chiefly turns upon botanical subjects, and was drawn up by my friend Dr. Falconer, a man whose knowledge is various and profound, whose discriminations upon all topics of literature are distinct and clear, and whose powers of generalization are ready, vigorous, and comprehensive. More than once it has fallen in my way to see some botanical pieces written by Dr. Shaw, of the British Museum; and happy am I in this opportunity of declaring the delight I felt from the pure and flowing latinity, the apposite and lucid expressions, the delicate sentiments, and the harmonious periods which adorn its charming compositions.

WILD.

If in writing or not writing upon politics I am to be governed by the advice of other men, "Quid sequar

aut quem?" One calls upon me to publish; but Mr. Wild, a man far superior in splendour of language, in depth of research, and elevation of mind, has given me counsel similar to that which Phalaris, in his Epistles, gave to Stesichorus—*μέλοιεν δέ σοι μούσων εὐκλέεις πόνοι.*—Vide Phalar. Epist. 147, and the end of Epist. 145. For the attainments, the talents, and the virtues of Mr. Wild, no man living entertains a more sincere respect than I do. Often have I been delighted, and sometimes instructed, by his late very eloquent work; and sure I am that he will not long be displeased with me for entertaining opinions different from his own upon topics which he has himself discussed very fully and very ably, and upon which I touched, and professed to touch, incidentally and concisely.

V. CRITICISMS.

Collectus.—The authority of Tretter, and Dan. Aveman, and Isaac Verbergius, will not remove my doubt of the propriety of this word.

Huic conjecturæ *aliquanto* faret. False Latin.

Proloquium.—I have elsewhere expressed my dissent from the learned Bishop of Worcester, who explains the word sermo in the Epistle to Augustus, by proem or introduction. Dr. C. I observe, translates introduction by proloquium. Now this translation will not be thought accurate either by

those who have read the words proloquium disjunctum, in book v. cap. 12, of Aulus Gellius, or by those who are acquainted with the full and correct explanation of the word proloquium in book xvi. cap. 8, of the same author, where Varro's definition is recorded and illustrated. Gesner, indeed, in his Thesaurus, produces a solitary example of proloquium for exordium, in the third Declamation ascribed to Quintilian. But the Declamation itself is the miserable reply of some monkish scribbler to the preceding speech pro milite Mariano; and even here the word proloquia does not mean exordia. The passage runs thus: "Patiatur et tua divina virtus, et Romanæ ceterum militiæ pia discretio, patiatur (inquam) necessaria communis causæ proloquia." Soon after we read, "fictum, precor, omnes, quod tribuno mendacissimo prolocutor objectat." Burman, in his note on the last passage, says, "Forte, fictum precor hominis crimen ignosce. Prolocutorem vero advocatum monachus vocat, qui loquitur pro milite, ubi vernaculæ linguæ ingenium agnoscere licet."—Vide Cangii Glossar. in Prælocutor et Prolocutor, et in Proloquia paulo ante.

In looking into Du Cange, I find that prælocutor is explained by advocatus, patronus, causidicus, and that sometimes he is called prolocutor. Noltenius writes thus on præloquium: "Præloquium in ecclesia hodie increbruit, quo quidem designant exordium illud prius, quod textui sacro cœtui prælegendo ratione quadam congruenti præmittitur; at veteres id vocabuli omnino ignorant."

"Qui emendant per proloquium, nempe isti er-

rant: id enim veteribus significat axioma luce sua radians; quod animum legentis illico ferit: sententia in qua nihil desideratur, interprete."—Varro apud Gellium, lib. xvi. cap. 8.

It appears then that proloquium is seldom or never used for a proem, even in the lower ages of Latinity. I am really at a loss to account for Dr. C.'s use of this word. I have looked into the English Dictionary prefixed to Patrick's edition of Ainsworth, and there I do not find proloquium under the word proem. A better word, procemium, is, indeed, to be found, and for this rhetorical word the Doctor might have met with authority in Cassiodorus, page 367 of the Antiqui Rhetores Latini, edit. Capperon, or in Quintilian, cap. 1, lib. iv. edit. Burman. But surely when a writer, being at liberty to use principium, or exordium, or procemium, yet uses proloquium, "he shows," as Lord Bacon says of the schoolmen, "a strange disregard to the pureness, pleasantness, and lawfulness of the phrase."

WAKEFIELD AND BISHOP HURD.

Anxious as I was to shelter from reproach the name of a man, whose virtue I so much love, and whose talents and learning I so highly admire, I took care to soften the harsh appearance of some of his words, by quoting in the British Critic for March other expressions from his Notes on Virgil, where he speaks with great and just respect of Bishop Hurd. But I will now pursue the same de-

sign, by quoting from Mr. Wakefield's Observations more terms of praise which he uses of the same illustrious prelate: "Bishop Hurd, if I may presume to question the sagacity of so great a name, and the very ingenious critic he cites, seem to have mistaken the true meaning of pulchra in line 99 of Horace de Arte Poetica;" and again, upon lines 212 and 214, "All the commentators have grossly erred in their explication of these two lines, and it is with peculiar concern that I cannot except even him, to whom this most exquisite composition is so much indebted for the elucidation of that unity of design, that harmony of connection, and that full colouring, which the obliquity of former critics had broken and almost dissipated." The same very learned author (with the utmost deference I speak it) judiciously reads, "aut tibi constet."

I am very glad to find that my learned friend Wakefield agrees with me in approving Bishop Hurd's conjecture of aut for et, in line 127 of Horace de Arte Poetica. The conjecture itself is ingenious, and the reasoning employed to support it is, in my opinion, decisive. The learned reader will, I trust, be yet more disposed to adopt the above-mentioned alteration, after considering the very judicious note of Maitland on line 1375 of the Iphigenia in Aulide. If the second volume of the Variorum Edition had been printed under my inspection, I should not have omitted this noble conjecture of Bishop Hurd. On looking lately into the copy of Wakefield's book, lent by me to Mr. Homer, I find several observations npon the art of poetry marked by me,

which do not appear in the second volume of the Variorum Edition.

PULMAN.

The book which I lent Mr. Homer before the Horace was sent to press, contained Pulmanni Annotationes in Q. Horat. Flacc.; Aldi Manuti Scholia, et de Metris Horatianis; M. Antonii Mureti Scholia; Joannis Hartungi Annotationes, published at Antwerp in 12mo, 1577; together with Jani Dousæ in novam Q. Horatii Editionem Commentariolus, published at Antwerp 1580. It is a valuable collection for any scholar to possess, and contains much information which ought to have appeared in the Variorum Edition. Mr. Homer, on returning it, told me that he had procured some of the editions in which are found the contents of my book; I see their names in Dr. Combe's Catalogue.

NOTES

ON

RAPIN'S DISSERTATION

ON

WHIGS AND TORIES.

NOTES

ON

RAPIN'S DISSERTATION.

PAGE 4.*—*Causes of the Stability of the British Government.*

FOR the causes that enabled England to preserve the form of government, which other nations have lost, see chap. I. of De Lolme—"While the kingdom of France, in consequence of the slow and gradual formation of the feudal government, found itself, in the issue, composed of a number of parts simply placed by each other, and without any reciprocal adherence; the kingdom of England, on the contrary, in consequence of the sudden and violent introduction of the same system, became a compound of parts united by the strongest ties; and the regal authority, by the pressure of its immense weight, consolidated the whole into one compact indissoluble body." Chap. I. page 15.

Another cause is assigned by the same writer, "When the tyrannical laws of the Conqueror became still more tyranically executed, the Lord, the vassal, the inferior vassal, all united. They even implored the assistance of the peasants and cottagers;

* The pages refer to an edition of Rapin's Dissertation, which will be published with Dr. Parr's Notes.

and that haughty aversion with which on the continent the nobility repaid the industrious hands which fed them, was, in England, compelled to yield to the pressing necessity of setting bounds to the royal authority." Page 23.

In chapter the second he states and explains a third advantage of England, viz. because it formed one undivided state—"England was not, like France, an aggregation of a number of different sovereignties; it formed but one state, and acknowledged but one master, one general title. The same laws, the same kind of dependence, consequently the same notions, the same interests, prevailed throughout the whole. The extremities of the kingdom could, at all times, unite to give a check to the exertions of an unjust power—from the river Tweed to Portsmouth, from Yarmouth to the Land's End, was all in motion; the agitation increased from the distance like the rolling waves of an extensive sea; and the monarch, left to himself, and destitute of resources, saw himself attacked on all sides by an universal combination of his subjects." Page 26.

Bolingbroke, in his dissertation upon parties, observes that, "the defects which he had censured in the Roman constitution of government, were avoided in some of those that were established on the breaking of that empire, by the northern nations and the Goths. In letters 14 and 15 he makes some judicious remarks on the origin and decline both of the Spanish and French governments. The Parliaments in France, he affirms, never gave the people any share in the government of that kingdom." When prerogative failed, they added, he

says, " a deputation of the commons to the assembly of the estates; that, seeming to create a new controul on the Crown, they might in reality give greater scope and freer exercise to arbitrary will." Letter 15.

Among other causes of the stability of the English government, are to be ranked, the unity of the executive power, the division of the legislative power, and the business of proposing laws, which is lodged in the hands of the people. These subjects are fully and ably discussed in the four first chapters of De Lolme on the English Constitution, Book II.

PAGE 6.—*Peculiarity of the British Government.*

How far the British government differs from republican governments, is shewn by De Lolme, chap. X. book II. In chapter XVII. is explained the total difference between the English monarchy as a monarchy, and every other monarchy with which we are acquainted; and in chapter XVIII. he shows, by the most decisive and important proofs, how far the examples of nations that have lost their liberty are applicable to England—" All the political passions of mankind, says he, if we attend to it, are satisfied and provided for in the English government; and whether we look at the monarchical, or the aristocratical, or the democratical part of it, we find all those powers already settled in it in a regular manner, which have an unavoidable tendency to arise, at one time or other, in all human societies." Page 427.

The reader will not be displeased to see the sagacious observations of Blackstone on this momentous subject—" These three species of government have, all of them, their several perfections and imperfections; democracies are usually the best calculated to direct the end of a law; aristocracies to invent the means by which that end shall be obtained; and monarchies to carry those means into execution. And the ancients, as was observed, had in general no idea of any other permanent form of government but these three: for though Cicero declares himself of opinion, " esse optime constitutam rempublicam, quæ ex tribus generibus illis, regali, optimo, et populari, sit modice confusa:" Yet Tacitus treats this notion of a mixed government, formed out of them all, and partaking of the advantages of each, as a visionary whim, and one that, if effected, could never be lasting or secure. Cunctas nationes et urbes populus, aut primores, aut singuli regunt; delecta ex his et constituta reipublicæ forma laudari facilius quam evenire, vel, si evenit, haud diuturna esse potest.—Ann. l. 4. But, happily for us of this island, the British Constitution has long remained, and I trust will long continue, a standing exception to the truth of this observation. For, as with us the executive power of the laws is lodged in a single person, they have all the advantages of strength and dispatch, that are to be found in the most absolute monarchy: and, " as the legislature of the kingdom is entrusted to three distinct powers, entirely independent of each other; first, the King; secondly, the Lords spi-

ritual and temporal, which is an aristocratical assembly of persons selected for their piety, their truth, their wisdom, their value, or their property; and thirdly, the House of Commons, freely chosen by the people from among themselves, which makes it a kind of democracy; as this aggregate body, actuated by different springs, and attentive to different interests, composes the British Parliament, and has the supreme disposal of every thing, there can no inconvenience be attempted by either of the three branches, but will be withstood by the other two; each branch being armed with a negative power, sufficient to repel any innovation which it shall think inexpedient or dangerous. Here then is lodged the sovereignty of the British Constitution; and lodged as beneficially as is possible for society." Page 50, vol. 1. Blackstone.

An Englishman may therefore say with Polybius, δῆλον ὡς ἀρίστην μὲν ἡγητέον πολιτείαν τὴν ἐκ πάντων τῶν προειρημένων ἰδιωμάτων συνεστῶσαν. What the same writer says of the Spartan government, may be said more truly and more illustriously of the British, τούτου γὰρ τοῦ μέρους οὐ λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἔργῳ πεῖραν εἰλήφαμεν. Page 628, vol. 1. Meg. Historiarum, lib. 6.

PAGE 7.—*Adjustment of its Powers.*

"Sometimes indeed the distribution is equal, either when the constituent parts depend mutually on each other, as in the English government; or when the authority of each part is independent,

though imperfect, as in Poland. This last form is a bad one, because there is no union in such a government, and the several parts of the state want a due connection."—Rousseau on the Social Compact, page 128.

Upon the influence of the Crown and the cooperation of the three forms in our government, which, in themselves, are yet distinct, some excellent observations are made in a late dialogue on the actual state of Parliament—" As the King is responsible to Parliament for the exercise of his prerogative through his ministers, as the right of treaties are subject to the division of Parliament, as Parliament furnish all pecuniary supplies, the prerogative is actually subservient to and dependent upon Parliament. If the Crown is dependent upon Parliament, the House of Lords is well known to be in a great degree dependent on the Crown, and both of them ultimately on the House of Commons. Such is the real state of those distinct and independent *rights* which theorists imagine operate in separate scales, as checks to one another; and yet, as circumstanced as they are, all these institutions have still their utility, and are beneficial to each other from their connection, though not by their mutual opposition, as it is falsely imagined." Page 7. —Page 17, he maintains that " it is upon the harmony, not the dissension, of these principles; upon the close and intimate connection, not upon the opposition of them, that depend the beauty and efficacy of the English Constitution." Doubtless, in the general course of government, these several

powers can and do unite for the general purpose for which they are respectively designed. Their privileges and rights, however distinct, are yet directed towards one common object; but when either affects to predominate excessively, to deviate from the plain and essential principles of the constitution, or to throw, by violence, even the forms of our government out of their course, it is the duty and the interest of the two other powers to check these encroachments by the firmest opposition and the most unequivocal dissension. The passage which I am now going to quote is so consistent with common experience, and yet so contrary to the common language of men upon these subjects, that I think it of importance to lay the whole before the reader —I assert freely, that, if the "three principles of government are better than one; if they cannot exist, independently, in King, Lords, Commons; if, in the course of our history, through all our revolutions, the powers of government have always united in the one branch that was predominant, to which the other two have been made subservient; it is far better for every good purpose, that such powers should devolve upon the House of Commons, than upon the King or upon the Peers; provided always, that the influence and spirit of the three principles accompany that power in the assembly that acquires it. I assert, therefore, that, if the House of Commons, which has assumed to itself the power, and in my opinion happily for this country, should ever be divested of any one of those three influences, to guide, temper, and regulate the exertions of that

power, that instant there is indeed a change and revolution, not in the form, but in the essence, of the government, which requires the three influences in the efficient part of the legislature to be, what it professes, *a mixed government.*

"The whole nicety consists in the adjusting and apportioning the *quantum of each influence,* so as to keep the balance even, without weighing down the others. As long as the patronage of the Crown affects the House of Commons only, so far as to induce a general support of public measures, and a bias towards the system that is pursued, not a blind confidence in, or prostituted devotion to, the minister; as long as the patrician influence extends no farther than to give to landed property and ancient establishments their just weight, without trampling upon the rights and interests of the people at large; and whilst the democratical principle in that assembly is restrained within such bounds as shall give equal liberty to every subject, impartial justice, and security to their persons and property, without the inconsistencies and extravagances of a popular government, I shall say all is well, and better than any alteration can hope to make it. I do not say this balance is actually adjusted with all the precision possible—wise and moderate checks may be thought of, from time to time, without dangerous experiments of innovation, to counteract the increasing influence of the Crown; and to such I shall be always ready to lend every assistance; as long as that weight appears to me, as it does at present, to predominate in the scale."—Dial. on the Act. State of Parliam. page 46.

These observations, however unpopular, are upon
whole just; if they jar with some well con-
ucted and well received theories, they yet have
merit of resting on the solid evidence of fact.
lo not agree with every position in this book: I
ubt whether the regal influence predominate in
scale, and I particularly disapprove of the vio-
t and declamatory invective which breaks out in
ge 53. But I confidently bear my testimony
ainst the decision of a most learned and amiable
n, whom I have the honour to call my friend,
en he pronounces the dialogue "the most laugh-
e and whimsical thing of the kind he ever met
h."—See page 22 of a letter to the author of a
mphlet, entitled Free Parliaments.

GE 9.—*The Dependency and Independency of Parliament.*

The dependency and independency of Parlia-
nt are thus elegantly stated by Bolingbroke—
The constitutional independency of each part of
legislature arises from hence, that distinct rights,
wers, and privileges are assigned to it by the con-
tution; but then this independency of one part
n be so little said to arise from the dependency
another, that it consists properly and truly in the
e, unbiassed, uninfluenced, and independent ex-
ise of these rights, powers, and privileges, by
ch part, in as ample an extent as the constitution
ows; or in other words, as far as that point
ere the constitution stops this free exercise, and

submits the proceedings of one part, not to the private influence, but to the public controul of the other parts. Before this point, the independency of each part is meant by the constitution to be absolute. From this point the constitutional *dependency of each part on the others* commences." Page 197, letter 12.—Such is the fair prospect which theory presents to us; but in practice, we are told by a respectable authority, "the share of power alloted by our constitution to the House of Commons is so great, that it absolutely commands all the other parts of the government." The same writer, who informs us of our danger, has pointed out what he represents, and what in some degree I am inclined to believe, the remedy—"The interest of the body is restrained by the interest of individuals, and the House of Commons stretches not its power, because such an usurpation would be contrary to the interest of the majority of its members. The Crown has so many offices at its disposal, that, when *assisted by the honest and disinterested part of the House*, it will always command the resolutions of the whole; *so far at least, as to preserve the ancient constitution from danger.* We may, therefore, give to this influence what name we please; we may call it by the invidious appellations of *corruption and dependence*; but *some* degree and some kind of it are *inseparable*, from the very nature of the constitution, and *necessary to the preservation of our mixed government.* Instead then of asserting absolutely, that the dependence of Parliament, *in every degree*, is an infringement of

British liberty, the country-party had better have made some concessions to their adversaries, and have only examined what was the *proper degree* of this dependence, beyond which it became dangerous to liberty." See Hume's Essay on the Independ. of Parl.—Though I mean not to be an advocate for corruption, I readily assent to the foregoing observations, and I am confident from long and serious observation, that the influence of the Crown, "arising from the offices and honours which are at its disposal," may be justified to the satisfaction of every impartial friend to the liberties of his country. "Such moderation (as Hume says) is not to be expected from party men of any kind." But it is a most dangerous position to say indiscriminately "that the Crown *can never have too little influence* over Members of Parliament," for *that* influence *may be* employed, and *has been* employed, so as to direct the passions and selfishness of men to the public good. "Polybius (as Hume remarks) justly esteems the pecuniary influence of the Senate and Censors in giving offices to be one of the regular and constitutional weights which preserved the balance of the *Roman* government." It will be asked, where dependence is to cease, and independence to begin? To this I answer, that when the cases practically exist, it will be no difficult task for wise and active Senators to foresee any dangers that are likely to arise, or to remedy those which have grown up imperceptibly. The constitution in its principles and in its forms has provided effectual remedies, and it must be left to the judgment of wise and

good men to apply them. But in respect to this and many other subjects of government, it is difficult and even dangerous to decide in speculation the proper medium between extremes, "both because it is not easy to find *words* (as Hume observes) proper to fix this medium, and because the good and ill, in such cases, run so gradually into each other, as even to render our *sentiments* doubtful and uncertain." The strength of contending parties, the reigning manners of the times, the pressing exigencies of war, and a variety of other circumstances, which are best understood when they actually exist, may render it proper for the influence of the Crown to be sometimes contracted and sometimes enlarged. It is always however to be remembered, that the very necessity which compels the Crown to have recourse to *influence*, implies a *real and rooted strength in those over whom it is employed.* The extent of influence is then a decisive proof of the weakness of prerogative. Doubtless in the hands of a profligate minister it may be abused to undermine the liberties of our country—under the direction of an able and an upright one, it may be employed to check licentiousness, and to make the ambition of individuals an useful instrument in promoting the welfare of the community.

Amidst the many who clamour against its excess, and exaggerate its dangers, there are few men so generous as to renounce its advantages, and yet fewer so infatuated as to wish its total extinction.

Conscious as I am of being actuated by a sincere love of constitutional and rational freedom, and a

fixed detestation against unconstitutional and corrupt influence, I deliver the foregoing sentiments without apology for their boldness, and without fear of their consequences. My opinions about the constitution, and my attachment to it, are founded not on visionary refinements, but on solid facts—not on the precarious assumptions and specious plans of rash or treacherous reformers, but on the clear and broad evidence of history—on the *real* characters and conduct of men, and on the real tendencies and natures of things themselves. It would therefore be weakness not to foresee, and cowardice not to despise, the rude invectives of those men, qui tanquam artifices improbi opus quærunt, et semper ægri aliquid esse in republicâ volunt, ut sit ad cujus curationem a populo adhibeantur. Livy, Lib. v. —That an independence amounting to separation, that a perpetual and restless jealousy, an undistinguishing and implacable spirit of opposition, must be injurious, between powers which are instituted for one common object, is an assertion which requires no proof.—Dr. Jebb, a most jealous and strenuous asserter of freedom, has the sagacity to discern, and the candour to acknowledge, that the freedom and independence of the King and Parliament are to be understood with restrictions. I transcribe with great pleasure, from the writings of that gentleman, these profound and temperate reflections.—" The proper rights and functions of each of these powers, and the passions incident to human nature, when placed *in certain circumstances*, tend, however, to unite them, on every occasion where

the public good requires their consent; and the same passions also tend to controul, or moderate, their mutual actions, and effectually to prevent their union, when such union would obstruct the general welfare of the state. I readily acknowledge, that, in this sense, no branch of the legislature can be considered as free and independent — they are all subjected, equally with individuals, to those moral causes, which, in the most exalted state of political liberty, with resistless energy, though frequently silent and unobserved, controul, direct, and modify the actions of mankind." See Jebb's address to the Freeholders of Middlesex, page 9.

After all, if the reader be yet alarmed at the power of the Crown to bestow places, let him know that the case is not yet desperate; for, "whatever ministers may govern, whatever factions may arise, let the friends of liberty lay aside the *groundless distinctions*, which are employed to amuse and betray them; let them continue to coalite; let them hold fast their integrity, and support with spirit and perseverance the cause of their country, and they will confirm the good, reclaim the bad, vanquish the incorrigible, and make the British constitution *triumph even over corruption*." This animated language was spoken by the haughty and exasperated railer against influence. It contains a safe and efficacious preservative against the encroachments of the Crown and the usurpations of the Parliament—may it be deeply impressed on the heart of every worthy citizen, who wishes to support the measures of government without venality,

as well as to oppose them without faction.—See Bolingbroke's Dissertation upon Parties, vol. III., page 294.

PAGE 12.—*Liberty of Northern Nations.*

The sagacious Montesquieu has assigned many both physical and political causes why liberty is natural to the northern nations. In Dr. Stewart's admirable dissertation on the antiquity of the English constitution, the reader will find a learned and philosophical explanation of the similarity which pervades the institutions and principles of government among the ancient Germans and those of the English.—See particularly part v. on the great Council or Parliament in Germany and England.

PAGE 12.—*Wittena-Gemote.*

"Among the most remarkable of the Saxon laws we may reckon first, the constitution of Parliaments, or rather, general assemblies of the principal and wisest men in the nation, the Wittena-Gemote, or *commune consilium* of the ancient Germans, which was not yet reduced to the forms and distinctions of our modern Parliament, without whose concurrence no new law could be made nor old one altered." Blackstone, vol. IV. page 413.

"In no portion of the Anglo-Saxon period does the power of the sovereign appear to have been exorbitant or formidable. The enaction of laws, and the supreme sway in all matters, whether civil or

ecclesiastical, were vested in the Wittena-Gemote, or great national assembly; this council consisted of King, Lords, and Commons, and exhibited a species of government, of which political liberty was the necessary consequence, as its component parts were mutually a check to one another. The free condition of the northern nations, and the peculiarity of their situation when they had made conquests, gave rise to this valuable scheme of administration, and taught the politicians of Europe what was unknown to antiquity, a distinction between despotism and monarchy." See Stewart's Dissertation prefixed to Sullivan's Lectures.

De Lolme indeed is willing to allow, with Selden, that at the æra of the conquest we are to look for the real foundation of the English constitution—"that the Saxon government was not subverted by William, and that conquest in the feudal sense only meant acquisition, are opinions, which, says he, have been particularly insisted upon in times of popular opposition; and indeed there was a far greater probability of success, in raising among the people the notions familiar to them of legal claims and long established customs, than in arguing with them from the *no less rational, but less determinate* and somewhat dangerous doctrines concerning the original rights of mankind, and the lawfulness of at all times opposing force to an oppressive government." —Page 8.

As the antiquity of every national claim renders it not only more pleasing to our imaginations, but more satisfactory to our reason, I shall endeavour

to efface the impressions which these remarks will probably make on the mind of the reader. In the first place De Lolme himself acknowledges "that as when the laws in question were again established, the public power in England continued in the same channel where the conquest has placed it, they were more properly *new modifications of the Anglo-Norman constitution*, than they were the *abolition* of it; or, since they were again adopted from the Saxon legislation, they were rather imitations of that legislation than the restoration of the Saxon government. Page 9.—To the concession of De Lolme upon this subject I subjoin the more decisive opinion of Bishop Hurd—"You do not, says Sir John Maynard, I am sure, expect from me, that I should go back to the elder and more remote parts of our history; that I should take upon me to investigate the scheme of government which hath prevailed in this kingdom from the time that the Roman power departed from us; or that I should lay myself out in delineating, as many have done, the plan of the Saxon constitution; though such an attempt might not be unpleasing, nor altogether without its use, as the principles of the Saxon policy, and in some respect the forms of it, have been constantly kept up in every succeeding period of the English monarchy. I content myself with observing, that the spirit of liberty was predominant in those times.—Dialogues, page 116.

After some acute reflections on the word *laga*, which meant both laws and countries, he says, "You see then how fully the spirit of liberty pos-

sessed the very language of our Saxon forefathers—and it might well do so; for it was the essence of the German constitutions; a just notion of which (so uniform was the genius of the brave people that planned them) may be gathered, you know, from what the Roman historians, and above all from what Tacitus hath recorded of them."—Page 118.

"The defenders of the regal power are conscious of the testimony which the Saxon times are ready to bear against them. They are wise enough to lay the foundation of their system in the conquest. We are told of his parcelling out the whole land, upon his own terms, to his followers; and we are insulted with his famous institution of feudal tenures. But what if the former of these assertions be foreign to the purpose at least, if not false; and the latter subversive of the very system it is brought to establish? I think I have reason for putting both these questions:—for, what if he parcelled out most, or all, of the lands of England to his followers? The fact has been much disputed—but be it, as they pretend, that the property of all the soil in the kingdom had changed hands, what is that to us who claim under our Norman, as well as Saxon ancestors? For the question, you see, is about the form of government settled in this nation at the time of the conquest; and they argue with us, from a supposed act of tyranny in the Conqueror, in order to come at that settlement. The Saxons, methinks, might be injured, oppressed, enslaved, and yet the constitution, transmitted to us

through his own Normans, be perfectly free."—Page 123.

"But their allegation is still more unfortunate. He instituted, they say, "the feudal law." True, "but the feudal law, and absolute dominion, are two things; and, what is more, perfectly incompatible.

"I take upon me to say, that I shall make out this point in the clearest manner—in the mean time it may help us to understand the nature of the feudal establishment, to consider the practice of succeeding times. What that was, our adversaries themselves, if you please, shall inform us—Mr. Somers has told their story very fairly; which yet amounts only to this; that, throughout the Norman and Plantagenet lines, there was one perpetual contest between the Prince and his feudatories for law and liberty; an evident proof of the light in which our forefathers regarded the Norman constitution. In the competition of the two *roses*, and perhaps before, they lost sight indeed of this prize—but no sooner was the public tranquillity restored, and the contending claims united in Henry VII. than the old spirit revived—a legal constitution became the constant object of the people; and though not always avowed, was, in effect, as constantly submitted to by the sovereign.

"It may be true, perhaps, that the ability of one Prince, the imperious carriage of another, and the generous intrigues of a third; but above all the condition of the times, and a sense of former miseries, kept down the spirit of liberty for some

reigns, or diminished at least the force and vigour of its operations. But a passive subjection was never acknowledged, certainly never demanded as matter of right, till Elizabeth, now and then, and King James, by talking continually in this strain, awakened the national jealousy; which proved so uneasy to himself, and in the end so fatal to his family.

"I cannot allow myself to mention these things more in detail to you, who have so perfect a knowledge of them. One thing only I insist upon, that, without connecting the system of liberty with that of prerogative in our notion of the English government, the tenor of our history is perfectly unintelligible, and that no consistent account can be given of it, but on the supposition of a *legal limited constitution*."—Page 126.

Bolingbroke traces up our constitution to high antiquity.

"The principles of the Saxon commonwealth were therefore very democratical, and these principles prevailed through all subsequent changes.

"The Danes conquered the crown, but they wore it little; and the liberties of the Saxon freemen they never conquered, nor wrought any alteration in the constitution of the government."—Rem. on Hist. of Engl., page 45.

"We may confess that William the Norman imposed many new laws and customs; that he made very great alterations in the whole model of government; and that he, as well as his two sons,

ruled, upon many occasions, like absolute, not limited monarchs.

" Yet neither he nor they could destroy the old constitution; because neither he nor they could extinguish the old spirit of liberty.

" On the contrary, the Normans and other strangers, who settled here, were soon seized with it themselves instead of inspiring a spirit of slavery into the Saxons.

" They were originally of Celtic or Gothic extraction (call it what you please), as well as the people they subdued. They came out of the same Northern hive, and therefore they naturally resumed the spirit of their ancestors, when they came into a country where it prevailed."—Ibid. page 46.

" These are the sources from which all the distinctions of rank and degree that exist at this day among us, have flowed. These are the general principles of all our liberties. That this Saxon constitution hath varied in many particulars, and at several periods of time, I am far from denying. That it did so, for instance, on the entry of the Normans, though certainly *not near so much as many have been willing to believe, and to make others believe*, is allowed. Nay, let it be allowed for argument's sake, and not otherwise, that during the first confusion and the subsequent disorders, which necessarily accompany and follow so great and so violent a revolution, the scheme of the Saxon constitution was broken, and the liberties of the people invaded, as well as the crown usurped. Let us even agree that laws were made without

the consent of the people; that officers and magistrates, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, were empowered without their election; in one word, that the Norman Kings and Lords had mounted each other too high to be Lords over freemen, and that the government was entirely monarchical and aristocratical, without any exercise of democratical power. Let all this be granted, and the utmost that can be made of it will amount to this — that confusion and violence at the entry, and for some time after, under the government of a foreign race, introduced many illegal practices, and some foreign principles of policy, *contrary to the spirit, and letter too, of the ancient constitution;* and that these Kings and the Lords abused their power over the freemen, by extortion and oppression, as Lords over tenants. But it will remain true, that neither Kings nor Lords, nor both together, could prevail over them, or gain their consent to give their right, or the law, up to the King's beck. But still the law remained arbiter both of King and people, and the Parliament supreme expounder and judge of it and them. Though the branches were lopped, and the tree lost its beauty for a time, yet the root remained untouched, was set in a good soil, and had taken strong hold in it; so that care, and culture, and time, were indeed required, and our ancestors were forced to water it, if I may use such an expression, with their blood; but with this care, and culture, and time, and blood, it shot up again with greater strength than ever, that we might sit quiet and happy under the shade of it; for if the

same form was not exactly restored in every part, yet a tree of the same kind, and as beautiful, and as luxuriant, as the former, grew up from the same roots.

"To bring our discourse to that point which is here immediately concerned, Parliaments were never interrupted, nor the right of any estate taken away, however the exercise of it might still be disturbed. Nay, they soon took the forms they still preserve, were constituted almost as they now are, and were entirely built on the same general principles, as well as directed to the same purposes." —Dissertat. on Parties, page 242.

PAGE 26.—*Power of Norman Kings.*

The despotic power of William is commonly ascribed to the introduction of feudal tenures—but the fact itself requires some explanation, and that explanation has been given by Hurd. He understands not, "as if the *whole system* of military services had been created by the Conqueror, for they were essential to all the Gothic or German constitutions. We may suppose, then, that they were only *new modelled* by this great Prince. And who can doubt that the form, which was now given to them, would be copied from that which the Norman had seen established in his own country? It would be copied then from the proper feudal form; the essence of which consisted in the perpetuity of the feud; whereas these military tenures had been elsewhere temporary only, or revocable

at the will of the Lord." Page 129.—But whether we suppose William to have introduced, or only to have altered and enlarged the feudal system, it is curious to observe, that the conquest, which for a time crushed the loose and unsettled liberties of our country, tended ultimately to enlarge and strengthen them; for, as De Lolme observes, "by conferring an immense as well as unusual power on the head of the feudal system, it compelled the nobility to contract a lasting and sincere union with the people."—Page 25.

"The Norman Kings of imperious tempers, assumed great power—the Barons did the same. The people groaned under the oppression of both. —This union was unnatural and could not last.—The Barons, enjoying a sort of feudatory sovereignty, were often partners, and sometimes rivals of the Kings—they had opposite interests and they soon clashed. Thus was the opportunity created of re-establishing a more equal free government than that which had prevailed after the Norman invasion."—Bolingbroke's Rem. on Hist. of Eng. page 48.

The first Kings of the Norman race were favoured by another circumstance, which preserved them from the encroachments of their Barons—"they were Generals of a conquering army, which was obliged to continue in a military posture, and to maintain great subordination under their leader, in

order to secure themselves from the revolt of the numerous natives, whom they had bereaved of all their properties and privileges. But though this circumstance supported the authority of William and his immediate successors, and rendered them extremely absolute, it was lost as soon as the Norman Barons began to incorporate with the nation, to acquire a security in their possessions, and to fix their influence over their vassals, tenants, and slaves; and the immense fortunes which the Conqueror had bestowed on his Chief Captains, served them to support their independency, and make them formidable to the Sovereign."—Hume, vol. II. page 113.

PAGE 18.—*The Conquest.*

Rapin is perhaps mistaken; *conquest* does not imply absolute and unlimited dominion; and William professedly derived his claim from testamentary succession. Hurd, page 121.—His victory, says Stuart, was over the person of Harold, and not over the rights of the nation.

PAGE 19.—*Henry I.*

"This Prince having ascended the throne to the exclusion of his elder brother, was sensible that he had no other means to maintain his power than by gaining the affection of his subjects; but at the same time, he perceived that it must be the affection of the whole nation; he therefore not only

mitigated the vigour of the feudal laws in favour of the Lords, but also annexed as a condition to the charter he had granted, that the Lords should allow the same freedom to their respective vassals."—De Lolme, page 24.

How far he executed or omitted to execute his promise, may be seen in Blackstone, vol. IV. page 421.

PAGE 20.—*Magna Charta.*

For the description of the *Magna Charta*, see Blackstone, page 424, vol. IV.; De Lolme, page 27. See a full history of it printed for Bell, 1769.

" In the Magna Charta the rights and privileges of the individual, as well in his person as his property, became settled actions. The foundation was laid on which those equitable laws were to rise which offer the same assistance to the poor and the weak, as to the rich and powerful."—De Lolme, page 29.

" And lastly, (which alone would have merited the title it bears, of the Great Charter,) it protected every individual of the nation in the free enjoyment of his life, and his property, unless declared to be forfeited by the judgment of his Peers, or the law of his land."—Blackstone, vol. IV. page 424.

" De Lolme comparing the Great Charter in which the Barons stipulated in favour of the bondmen with the treaty concluded between Lewis XI. and several of the Princes and Peers of France, says, " in this treaty, which was made in order to

terminate a war which was called a war for the public good (*pro bono publico,*) no provision was made but concerning the particular power of a few Lords; not a word was inserted in favour of the people."—Page 30.

PAGE 22.—*Earl of Leicester.*

"Leicester summoned a new Parliament in London, where, he knew, his power was uncontrolable; and he fixed this assembly on a more democratical basis than any which had ever been summoned since the foundation of the monarchy. Besides the Barons of his own party, and several ecclesiastics who were not immediate tenants of the Crown, he ordered returns to be made of two Knights from every shire, and what is more remarkable, of deputies from the boroughs; an order of men which in former ages had always been regarded as too mean to enjoy a place in the national councils. This period is generally esteemed the epoch of the House of Commons, and it is certainly the first time that historians speak of any representatives to Parliament sent by the boroughs."—Hume's Hist. Eng. vol. II. page 211.

Lest the foregoing passage, by lessening the antiquity, should be thought also to lessen the dignity of the House of Commons, I subjoin the following sentences from the same writer: "Though that House derived its existence from so precarious and even so invidious an origin as Leicester's usurpation, it soon proved, when summoned by the legal

Princes, one of the most useful, and in process of time, one of the most powerful members of the national constitution, and gradually rescued the kingdom from aristocratical as well as from regal tyranny. But Leicester's policy, if we must ascribe to him so great a blessing, only forwarded by some years an institution for which the general state of things had already prepared the nation; and it is otherwise inconceivable that a plant, set by so inauspicious a hand, could have attained to so vigorous a growth, and have flourished in the midst of such tempests and convulsions."

Bishop Hurd, in his Dialogues, confirms and elucidates these remarks of Hume, on the growing preparation of causes for the establishment of the power of the Commons.—"Supposing the House of Commons to be of late origin, what follows? That the House is an usurpation on the prerogative? Nothing less—it was *gradually brought forth by time*, and grew up under the favour and good liking of our Princes. The constitution itself supposed the men of the greatest consequence in the commonwealth to have a seat in the national councils. Trade and agriculture had advanced vast numbers into consequence, that before were of small consequence in this kingdom. The public consideration was increased by their wealth, and the public necessities relieved by it. Were these to remain for ever excluded from the King's councils? or was not that council, which had liberty for its object, to widen and expand itself in order to receive them? It did, in fact, receive them with

open arms, and in so doing conducted itself on the very principles of the old feudal policy."—Hurd's Dialogues, page 165.

PAGE 23.—*Antiquity of the Commons.*

Hume, in a masterly and elaborate dissertation on the feudal and Anglo-Norman government, contends that the Commons were no part of the Great Council—" It is agreed that the Commons were no part of the Great Council till some ages after the conquest; and that the military tenants alone of the Crown composed that supreme and legislative assembly."—Vol. II. page 116.

" If in the long period of 200 years, which elapsed between the conquest and the latter end of Henry III. and which abounded in factions, revolutions, and convulsions of all kinds, the House of Commons never performed one single legislative act so considerable as to be once mentioned by any of the numerous historians of that age, they must have been totally insignificant. And in that age, what reason can be assigned for their ever being assembled? Can it be supposed that men of so little weight or importance possessed a negative voice against the King and the Barons? Every page of the subsequent histories discovers their existence, though these histories are not writ with greater accuracy than the preceding ones, and indeed scarcely equal them in that particular." — Vol. II. page 119.

To the argument drawn from the summons in Henry III.'s time, Lord Kaimes, in his Essay on

the Constitution of Parliament, has given an answer, which to me is nearly satisfactory—"Whether the royal burrows were originally constituent members of Parliament is a point much debated. It is observed, that in England there is no evidence upon record of burgesses being called to Parliament before 49 Henry III. at which time writs were directed to the Sheriffs of the several counties to return knights of the shire and burgesses; whence it is conjectured, that the calling of the burgesses to Parliament was a politic of Simon De Montfort, who had at that time the power of the kingdom in his hands, and who called the Parliament 49 Henry III. in order to purge himself from suspicions spread abroad of his intending to usurp the Crown.

"Notwithstanding these specious facts and observations, I am of opinion, that the *royal burrows made originally* one of the estates of Parliament.

"Though there is no mention of calling burgesses to the English Parliament before the 49 Henry III. it appears to me a very lame inference, that the practice began at this time, when we find the records of *preceding transactions so imperfect*. At the same time, were these records entire, and were there no instance before that period of a writ directed to the Sheriff for calling burgesses to Parliament, it would not follow that the royal burrows were no sooner assumed as a branch of the legislature—this must be explained. It is mentioned above to have been the practice in King John's days to call only the greater Barons by name, and

to leave the lesser Barons and freeholders to be summoned by the Sheriff edictally, or in *general terms*. Probably the representatives from burrows were ranked with the lesser Barons, and not honoured with a personal citation. When the attendance of the smaller Barons came to be dispensed with, upon their sending representatives, this change in the constitution introduced an alteration in the stile of the writs directed to the Sheriffs. Instead of the old form, enjoining the Sheriffs to notify publickly the holding of the Parliament, that all who were bound might attend, he was commanded specially to return two Knights of the Shire: this made it necessary to be equally special with regard to the representatives of the burrows; and therefore, in the writ, he was directed to return two Knights and two burgesses. This circumstance therefore, *proves nothing further* than that, in Henry III.'s time, the *stile* of the writ was *changed* and made special, instead of being conceived, as formerly, in general terms. But farther: the circumstances of the case are a strong evidence to me, that this was not the first time the attendance of the burrows in Parliament was required.—Historians mention, that this Parliament was called by Montford, in order to purge himself of a suspicion, which was gaining ground, of his aiming at the Crown. It is not said he had any particular connexion with the burrows, to make their presence of use to him; and unless it were in some such view, I cannot imagine that Montford would, in such ticklish circumstances, think of making any *altera-*

tion in the constitution. At the same time the *plain and simple stile* of the writ proves it to have been a common and known writ of the law of England. Had any thing extraordinary been enjoined, in must have been introduced with a preamble to support the command; especially as this was not a matter of course, but a summons, which the burrows were not bound to obey."—On the Constit. of Parliament, p. 38.

Sullivan, in page 212 of his Lectures, asserts "that the feudal principles were principles of liberty, but not of liberty to the whole nation, or even to the conquerors; I mean as to the point I am now upon, of having a share in the legislation—that was reserved to the military tenants, and to such of them only as held immediately of the King."

Yet these very institutions contained within themselves the seeds of a larger and more liberal plan of freedom than is at first perceived by a superficial observer.—In page 17 we have seen, that, by strengthening the hands of the King, the feudal system made a closer union between the people and the Barons, necessary to check the enormous growth of regal power. In its consequences, therefore, the very system which seemed to throw a dangerous weight into the hands of the Nobles, paved the way for such a gradual acquisition of power to the people, as enabled them to resist, not less the encroachments of the Barons, from whom their power was primarily derived, than to the King, against whom it was primarily exerted. It is indeed curious to observe, how much events baffle all the con-

trivances of human policy. The evil actually removed by them is both in degree and kind very different from that which they were originally designed to remove.—The good which we expect from them often extends beyond our *immediate* expectations, and, if foreseen, would be rejected as inconsistent with our *present* interests. Thus our ignorance, as well as our wisdom, contributes to the general welfare of the community; and, by the admirable constitution of the moral world, while we directly and deliberately pursue our own happiness, we become involuntarily and eventually the instruments of greater happiness to other men.

Those seeming contradictions, which I have just now mentioned in the feudal system, are happily reconciled by Bishop Hurd.—"Freedom" says Mr. Somers, "is a form of much latitude.—The Norman constitution may be free in one sense, as it excludes the sole arbitrary dominion of one man; and yet servile enough in another, as it leaves the government in few hands." To this Sir John Maynard replies,—"It is true, the proper feudal form, especially as established in this kingdom, was in a high degree oligarchical—it would not otherwise, perhaps, have suited to the condition of those military ages—yet the *principles* it went upon were those of public liberty, and generous enough to give room for the extension of the system itself, when a *change* of circumstances should require it." —Hurd's Dialogues, p. 146.

To the reader, whose mind is awed and oppressed by the authority of Mr. Hume, it may afford some

consolation to be told, that his opinions concerning the late origin of Parliament have been opposed with great depth of learning, and great acuteness of argumentation, by Dr. Stuart.—It is very remarkable also, that from the known condition of society during the earlier ages of our history, Hume (vol. II. p. 124,) infers, that the Commons *were not*, and Stuart (p. 288) that they *were* admitted as members of the legislative body.

In page 121 of his Remarks on the Public Law and Constitution of Scotland, Stuart maintains, that the burgesses were the true and ancient Commons of the kingdom.

"It has been usual, indeed, to represent the boroughs as in a state of uniform and entire wretchedness and misery, from the earliest times till the establishment of communities and corporations in the 12th and 13th centuries. But though no conclusion in the history of the European kingdoms has been insisted upon with great vehemence, there is none which is more untenable." I most earnestly recommend the whole of this chapter, and the admirable notes by which it is illustrated, to the perusal of the reader.

In Dial. Hurd, vol. II. p. 157, some distinctions are laid down between Knights of the Shire and Burgesses—"The Knights were appointed to represent not all the freeholders of counties, but the lesser tenants of the Crown only; the Burgesses represented towns which had formerly been in the jurisdiction of the King and his Lords,"

"But when the military spirit declined, and commercial prevailed, it was no longer reasonable, or

the interest of the Crown, that these bodies of men should not be admitted into the public councils."—Ibidem, p. 159.

But Dr. Stuart supposes "the constitutional rights of the Commons to have existed at a much earlier period," and to "have received a temporary interruption amidst the lawless confusion introduced between regal and aristocratical dominion."—Discourse on the Laws and Gov. of Eng. p. 15.

In page 19 of this Discourse, Stuart speaks of a work in which he "hopes to have an opportunity of treating the antiquity of the Commons at greater length." In page 281 of his Dissertation on the antiquity of the English Constitution, he intimates "a design of exhibiting a connected view of several direct arguments, which prove a representation of the Commons before the 49th of Henry III."

It were to be wished, that this able judge and strenuous defender of our free Constitution, would gratify the expectation which he has long excited—for the execution of such a task he is eminently qualified, because he possesses at once, the diligence of an antiquarian, the precision of a lawyer, and the more enlarged views of an historian.

Much information has been collected on the antiquity of the Commons, as forming a part of the legislature, in Tyrrel's Bibl. Polit.—The learned writer of Observations on the more Ancient Statutes, seems, however, to be feebly impressed by the evidences which Tyrrel has produced, and professes to consider the whole subject as little more

than "a point of speculation adapted to the discussion of an antiquary." Even in this point of view, no man is more able than Mr. Barrington to select and arrange such evidence as may lead to the determination of the question, which, if curious only in its materials, is in its principles not unimportant. The rights we now enjoy may, doubtless, be supported by arguments *more obvious* and *more convincing* than long possession—*yet*, from the very frame of the human mind, *this* circumstance renders every political advantage *more pleasing* and indeed *more secure*; for the *continuance* of any right is a presumptive proof of its *fitness*, and therefore increases the guilt and the danger of every attempt to take it away.—"Antiquity," says Hume, Essay iv. "always begets the opinion of right; and whatever disadvantageous sentiments we may entertain of mankind, they are always found to be prodigal, both of blood and treasure, in the maintenance of public justice. This passion we may denominate enthusiasm, or we may give it what appellation we please; but a politician, who should overlook its influence on human affairs, would prove himself but of a very limited understanding."—Essays, vol. i. p. 32.

For the mere amusement of the reader, I set before him Mr. Barrington's ingenious interpretation of the word parliament—"It is a compound of the two Celtic words *parley* and *ment* or *mend*; Bullet renders *parley* by the French infinitive *parler*; and we use the word in English as a substantive, viz. *parley*; ment or mend is translated *quantiti, abondance*; the word parliament therefore resolved

into its constituent syllables, may not improperly be said to signify what the Indians of North America call a great talk."—P. 68.

Henry III.

It is remarked by Dr. Robertson, "that Conquerors, though usually the bane of human kind, proved often, in the feudal times, the most indulgent of Sovereigns; they stood most in need of supplies from the people, and not being able to compel them by force to submit to the necessary impositions, they were obliged to make them some compensations by equitable laws and popular concessions.—The remark is in some measure, though imperfectly, justified by Henry III.—He took no steps of moment without consulting his Parliament, and obtaining their approbation, which he afterwards pleaded as a reason for their supporting his measures."—Runnington upon Hale, p. 180.

PAGE 28.—*Policy of the Tudors.*

"From the first to the last of the *Tudor line*, imperious and despotic as they were of their own nature, no extraordinary stretch of power was ventured upon by any of them but under the countenance and protection of an Act of Parliament.—Hence it was that the Star Chamber, though the jurisdiction of this court had the authority of the common law, was confirmed by statute; that the proceeding of Empson and Dudley had the sanction

of Parliament; that Henry VIII.'s supremacy, and all acts of power dependent upon it, had the same foundation; in a word, that every thing which wore the face of an absolute authority in the King, was not in virtue of any supposed inherent prerogative in the Crown, but the special grant of the subject. No doubt this compliance, and particularly, if we consider the lengths to which it was carried, may be brought to prove the obsequious and even abject disposition of the times, though we allow a good deal, as I think we should, to prudence and good policy; but then the Parliament by taking care to make every addition to the Crown their own *proper* act, left their Kings no pretence to consider themselves as absolute and independent."—Hurd's Dial. vol. II. p. 268.

"The kings of England continued, even in the time of the Tudors, to have but one assembly, before which he could lay his wants and apply for relief. How great soever the increase of his power was, a single Parliament alone could furnish him with the means of exercising it; and whether it was that the members of this Parliament entertained a deep sense of their advantages, or whether private interest exerted itself in aid of patriotism, they at all times vindicated the right of granting, or rather refusing, subsidies; and amidst the general wreck of every thing they ought to have held dear, they at least clung obstinately to the plank which was destined to prove the instrument of their preservation."—De Lolme, p. 45.

PAGE 29.—*Henry Seventh.*

Bolingbroke, speaking of Henry VII. says—"We must not conclude that this King made force the *sole*, though he made it the principal expedient of his government; he was wise enough to consider that his court was not the nation, and that, however he might command with a nod in the one, he must captivate, at least in some degree, the good-will of mankind, to make himself secure of being long obeyed in the other; nay more, that he must make his people some amends for the oppressions which his avarice particularly exposed them to suffer. For these reasons, as he strained his prerogative, on some occasions very high, so he let *it down again upon others*, and affected to show to his Parliaments *much condescension*, notwithstanding his pride, as well as much communication of council, notwithstanding his reserve."—Rem. on Hist. of Eng. p. 94.

PAGE 29.—*Henry Eighth.*

Upon the exorbitant power of the Crown, and the servile obsequiousness of Parliament, see Bolingbroke, pp. 108, 109, of the Remarks on the Hist. of Eng.—"The absolute power which Henry VIII. exercised over the purses, lives, liberties, and consciences of his people, was due to the entire influence which he had gained over the Parliament; and this dependency of the two Houses on the King did, in effect, establish tyranny by law."—Bolingbroke, p. 110.

The various and uncommon causes of Henry's power are most profoundly traced, and most correctly described by Hurd. They are to be found in the recent depression of the Barons under his father, in the cessation of the civil wars, in the undefined authority and timid spirit of the Commons, in the translation of the Pope's supremacy to the King, in the high spiritual pretensions, and the great temporal wealth which that event brought along with it—"The Throne did not only stand by itself, as having no longer a dependence on the papal chair—it rose still higher, and was, in effect, erected upon it—for the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was not annihilated but transferred, and all the powers of the Roman Pontiff now centered in the King's person. Henceforth then we are to regard him in a more awful point of view; as armed with both swords at once;" and as Nat. Bacon expresses it in his way, as a strange kind of monster, "a King with a Pope in his belly."—Hurd's Dialogues, vol. II. p. 259.

"In the mean time the nation rejoiced with great reason at its deliverance from a foreign tyranny; and the lavish distribution of that wealth which flowed into the King's coffers from the suppressed monasteries, procured a ready submission from the great and powerful to the King's domestic tyranny.

"In a word, every thing contributed to the advancement of the regal power, and, in that, to the completion of the great designs of Providence. The amazing revolution, which had just happened, was at all events to be supported; and thus, partly by fear, and partly by interest, the Parliament went

along with the King in all his projects; and, beyond the example of former times, was constantly obsequious to him, even in the most capricious and inconsistent measures of his government." Ibid. p. 261.—"Yet, in these very reigns, the foundations of our liberty were laid broader and stronger than ever."—Bolingbroke, Rem. on Hist. of Engl. p. 90.

PAGE 31.—*Bolingbroke's contrast between Elizabeth and James.*

The contrast between Elizabeth and James is so beautifully drawn by Lord Bolingbroke, that I cannot deny myself the pleasure of transcribing it—"Elizabeth had been jealous of her prerogative, but moderate in the exercise of it. Wiser James imagined, that the higher he carried it, and the more rigorously he exerted it, the more strongly he should be seated on his throne. He mistook the *weight* for the *strength* of a sceptre; and did not consider that it was never so likely to slip, or be wrenched out of a Prince's hands, as when it is heaviest. He never reflected that prerogative is of the nature of a spring, which by much straining will certainly relax, and often break; that in one case it becomes of little, in the other of no use at all."—Lett. xix. on the Hist. Eng.

PAGE 31.—*Elizabeth.*

Bolingbroke, in order to degrade the government of James I. and to calumniate the administration of

Walpole with greater success, has decorated the character of Elizabeth with a most splendid panegyric. His remarks upon her reign have a strange mixture of truth and falsehood, and they are evidently designed to palliate her faults, and exaggerate her excellencies. But in all historical inquiries we cannot flatter the prejudices of a reader without insulting his understanding; we do both when we substitute theory for fact, and represent things as we wish them to have been, not, as they really were. "Elizabeth, (says Nat. Bacon) "never altered, continued, repealed, nor explained any law, otherwise than by act of parliament, whereof there are multitudes of examples during her reign." But as Hume properly observes, "the legislative power of the Parliament was a mere fallacy while the Sovereign was universally allowed to possess a dispensing power, by which all the laws could be invalidated and rendered of no effect."—Vol. v. p. 463.

Dr. Stuart speaks in these favourable terms—"Her jealousy of prerogative was corrected by her attachment to the felicity of her people; and the popularity with which she reigned is the fullest proof that she preserved inviolated all the barriers of liberty. The reformation which the folly of her predecessor had interrupted was completed by her prudence." To this encomium he subjoins the following candid and judicious restrictions: "I do not mean to say that Elizabeth, and the Princes who preceded her, never acted against the spirit of our government—her reign, and those of many of her predecessors, were doubtless stained with many bold

exertions of authority; but bold exertions of authority must not be interpreted to infer despotism in our government—we must separate the personal qualities of princes and the principles of the constitution. The government of England and the administrations of its chief magistrates are very different things."—Dissertation prefixed to Sullivan's Lectures, p. 27.

Hume is supposed to have dwelt more fully upon the oppressions of Elizabeth's reign, that he might apologize more successfully for the lofty pretensions of her successor. I will not enter into an invidious and perhaps fruitless discussion of the motives, which influenced him in counteracting the prejudices and detecting the misrepresentations of preceding writers. But in the masterly character which he has drawn of this Queen, he has done ample justice "to her singular talents for government, to the force of her mind, which controled her more active and stronger qualities, to her heroism, which was exempt from temerity, her frugality from avarice, her friendship from partiality, her active temper from turbulency and a vain ambition." There is no period which more deserves to be understood than the reign of Elizabeth, and I think Hume has enabled every impartial reader to understand it well. In an appendix, which is written at once with the utmost historical fidelity, and the utmost philosophical penetration, he has shown, "that *the most absolute* authority of the Sovereign (to make use of the Lord Keeper's expression) was established on above twenty branches of prerogative which are now abolished,

and which were, every one of them, totally incompatible with the liberty of the subject. But what insured more effectually the slavery of the people than even these branches of prerogative, was the established principles of the times, which attributed to the Prince such an unlimited and undefeasable power as was supposed to be the origin of all law, and could be bounded and circumscribed by none." —Hume, vol. v. p. 469,

To many of his readers this language of Mr. Hume will be very offensive; yet I cannot persuade myself to suspect any insidious or malignant designs against the cause of liberty in a writer, who closes his inquiry into the reign of Elizabeth with these just and interesting reflections:—"The utmost that can be said in favour of the government of that age (and perhaps it may be said with truth) is, that the power of the Prince, though really unlimited, was exercised after the European manner, and entered not into every part of the administration; that the instances of a high exerted prerogative were not so frequent as to render property sensibly insecure, or reduce the people to a total servitude; that the freedom from faction, the quickness of execution, and the promptitude of those measures which could be taken for offence or defence, made some compensation for the want of a legal and determined liberty; that as the Prince commanded no mercenary army, there was a tacit check on him, which maintained the government in that medium to which the people had been accustomed; and that this situation of England, though seemingly it approached nearer,

was in reality more remote from a despotic and eastern monarchy, than the present government of that kingdom, where the people, though guarded by multiplied laws, are totally naked, defenceless, and disarmed; and besides are not secured by any middle power interposed between them and the monarch."

The Dialogues of Hurd on the reign of Elizabeth are written with great delicacy of sentiment, and the most finished elegance of style; they abound with curious remarks on the personal qualities of the Princess, and the peculiar manners of her time; but they throw a very feeble light on the political history of her government; they are not marked by the strong features of sagacity and impartiality which distinguish the investigation of Hume. It is observable that Arbuthnot, the zealous and steady advocate of Elizabeth, makes this concession, "if her government was at any time oppressive, the English constitution, as it *then* stood, as well as her own nature, had a good deal that bias." Vol. II. p. 82.—I cannot suppose my reader unacquainted with the character of Elizabeth drawn by the great Bacon. This extraordinary composition ought not to be read without the strictest and most vigilant attention to the temper and situation of the writer.

PAGE 33.—*James the First.*

"Among the many advantages which king James had, on his accession to the throne of England, we might very justly reckon the recent example of his

predecessor. Her penetration discovered the consequences of that great change in the balance of property, of which we have spoken in letters XI. and XII. and she accommodated at once the whole system of her government to it, as we have there observed. Whatever doubts she might have entertained concerning the success of her own measures before she had experienced the happy effects of them, king James could reasonably entertain none. Experience, as well as reason, pointed out to him the sole principle on which he could establish his government with advantage, or even with safety; and queen Elizabeth's reign had every year afforded him fresh proofs that this principle of government, which is easy in the pursuit, is effectual in the end to all purposes which a good man and a just prince can desire to obtain. But king James paid as little regard to her example as to her memory."—Lett. XVII. Hist. Eng.

How far the conduct of preceding monarchs justified the high notions which James entertained and avowed of the imperial dignity is a question of great importance, and has been ably discussed by Bishop Hurd. He closes his Inquiry with these words:—"Thus we see that, through the entire reign of the House of Tudor, that is, the most despotic and arbitrary of our princes, the forms of liberty were still kept up, and the constitution maintained even amidst the advantages of all sorts which offered for the destruction of both. The Parliament indeed was obsequious, was servile, was directed, if you will; but every proceeding was authorized and con-

firmed by Parliament. The King, in the mean time, found himself at his ease; perhaps he believed himself absolute, and considered his application to Parliament as an act of mere grace and popular condescension. At least, after so long experience of their submission, the elder James certainly thought himself at liberty to entertain this belief of them; but he was the first of our princes that durst avow it plainly and openly. He was stimulated, no doubt, to this usurpation of power in England by the memory of his former subjection, or servitude rather to the church of Scotland." Vol. [II. p. 269.—I quote this passage only to show that the concurrence of Parliament in the tyrannical measures of his predecessor is insufficient to support the wild and dangerous opinions which James entertained of the regal power, and the violent measures which he took to establish it. I am far from every wish to insinuate the pernicious and monstrous doctrine, that when a servile Parliament concurs with a despotic King, the constitution itself is not endangered. To prevent such a conclusion I will deliver my own sentiments upon this head in the manly and unanswerable language of Bolingbroke, where he speaks of the attempt made by James on the privilege of the House of Commons in the case of elections:—"Whether the will of the Prince becomes a law, by force of prerogative and independently of Parliament; or whether it is so made upon every occasion by the concurrence of Parliament; arbitrary power is alike established—the only difference lies here; every degree of this power, which is ob-

tained without Parliament, is obtained against the forms as well as against the spirit of the constitution, and must therefore be obtained with difficulty and possessed with danger. Whereas in the other method of obtaining and exercising this power by and with Parliament, if it can be obtained at all, the progress is easy and short, and the possession of it is so far from being dangerous, that liberty is disarmed as well as oppressed by this method; that part of the constitution which was instituted to oppose the encroachments of the Crown, the mal-administration of men in power, and every other grievance being influenced to abet these encroachments, to support this mal-administration, and even to concur in imposing the grievances. National concurrence can be acquired only by a good Prince, and for good purposes; because public good alone can be a national motive. But king James was not ignorant that private good may be rendered a superior motive to particular men, and that it is morally possible to make even Parliaments subservient to the worst purposes of a court."—Remarks on Hist. Eng. Lett. xx. p. 22.

PAGE 34.—*Duke of Buckingham.*

In this strong colouring Hume draws the character of the detested favourite:—"Some accomplishments of a courtier he possessed; of every talent of a minister he was utterly devoid; headlong in his passions, and incapable equally of prudence and of dissimulation; sincere from violence rather than

candour; expensive from profusion rather than generosity; a warm friend, a furious enemy; but without any choice or discernment in either; but with these qualities he had early and quickly mounted to the highest rank, and partook at once of the insolence which attends a fortune newly acquired, and the impetuosity which belongs to persons born in high stations, and unacquainted with opposition."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 128.

"He had in his own days, and he hath in ours, the demerit of beginning a struggle between prerogative and privilege, and of establishing a sort of warfare between the Prince and the people." Rem: on Hist. Eng. vol. II. p. 220, lett. XX. This idea seems to have been strongly impressed on the mind of Bolingbroke; he expresses it with great warmth in his Dissertation upon Parties—"If the principles of king James and king Charles's reigns had been disgraced by better, they would not have risen again; but they were kept down for a time by worse, and therefore they rose again at the restoration, and revived with the monarchy. Thus that epidemical taint with which James infected the minds of men, continued upon us; and it is scarce hyperbolical to say, that this prince has been the original cause of a series of misfortunes to this nation, as deplorable as a lasting infection in our air, of our water, or our earth, would have been."—Bolingbroke's Dissert. upon Parties, vol. III. p. 51.

The evils which alarmed the fears of Rapin, and

provoked the indignation of Bolingbroke, are in our days considerably diminished. The haughty and arrogant pretensions of the Crown are no longer heard; its powers were limited by law at the revolution, and all the habits of government have gradually conformed to the principles which were then established. In the time of Rapin the effects of the revolution were less distinctly understood, and less extensively felt than in the present age; but the most suspicious and irritable enemies to regal authority have now little to fear from that quarter, and accordingly their complaints are levelled not so much against the direct as the *indirect* power of the Crown—not so much against the violence of prerogative, as against the encroachments of influence. Bolingbroke himself, when he is describing the administration of Walpole, often loses sight of the old contest between the prerogative of the Crown and the freedom of the people. The thunders of his eloquence are pointed not against open tyranny, but secret corruption. In the pursuit of energy this beautiful writer is often regardless of precision.

PAGE 35.—*Charles the First.*

The notes on Charles's reign will be chiefly drawn from Mr. Hume, because the testimony of a writer who was a professed apologist for the Stuart race, will add weight to the sentiments of Rapin, whose political tenets leaned towards the popular side.

Before I begin those notes, I wish to impress on

the mind of the reader a very sensible observation of Bishop Hurd—"It may be of little moment to us at this day to inquire how far the Princes of the house of Stuart were blameable for their endeavours to usurp on the constitution. But it must ever be of the highest moment to maintain, that we had a constitution to assert against them. Party writers perpetually confound these two things."—Dialog. vol. II. p. 223.

"Charles I. had imbibed the same lofty conceptions of kingly power, and his character was marked by the same incapacity for real business."—Stuart's Discourse on Laws, p. 28.—"The imprudence of Buckingham had not softened his obstinacy."—P. 29.

I look back with mingled feelings of indignation and of sorrow on the strides which Charles unfortunately took towards arbitrary power. But reflecting on the fascinating power of early education, comparing the virtues of this unhappy Monarch with his faults, and remembering the peculiar difficulties which attended his reign, I recommend to the serious consideration of every wise and good man these just and generous observations of Lord Bolingbroke:—"We have said, in a former discourse, that king Charles came a party-man to the Throne, and that he continued an invasion to the people's rights, whilst he imagined himself only concerned in the defence of his own. In advancing this proposition,

we were far from meaning a compliment at the expence of truth—we avow it as an opinion we have formed on reading the relations published on all sides, and to which it seems to us, that all the authentic anecdotes of those times may be reconciled. This Prince had sucked in with his milk those absurd principles of government, which his father was so industrious, and, unhappily for king and people, so successful in propagating. He found them espoused as true principles, both of religion and policy, by a whole party in the nation, whom he esteemed friends to the constitution in church and state; he found them opposed by a party, whom he looked on indiscriminately as enemies to the church and to monarchy. Can we wonder that he grew zealous in a cause which he understood to concern himself so nearly, and in which he saw so many men who had not the same interest, and might therefore be supposed to act on a principle of conscience equally zealous? Let any one who has been deeply and long engaged in the contests of party ask himself, on cool reflection, whether prejudices concerning men and things have not grown up and strengthened with him, and obtained an uncontrolable influence over his conduct—we dare appeal to the inward sentiments of every such person. With this habitual bias upon him king Charles came to the Throne, and, to complete the misfortune, he had given all his confidence to a madman."—See Bolingbroke's Remarks on Hist. Eng. lett. XXIII. p. 270.

"These ills were ascribed not to the refractory

disposition of the two former Parliaments, to which they were partly owing, but solely to Charles's obstinacy in adhering to the counsels of Buckingham; a man no wise entitled by his birth, age, services, or merit, to that confidence reposed in him. To be sacrificed to the interest, policy, and ambition of the great, is so much the common lot of the people, that they may appear unreasonable who would pretend to complain of it. But to be the victim of the frivolous gallantry of a favourite, and of his boyish caprices, seemed the subject of peculiar indignation."—Hume's Hist. Eng. vol. VI. p. 238.

The behaviour of the Stuarts may be yet farther explained (for I wish not to justify it) by the judicious remark of Mr. Hume—"We must conceive that monarchy, on the accession of the house of Stuart, was possessed of very extensive authority; an authority in the judgment of all not exactly limited; in the judgment of some not limitable. But at the same time this authority was founded merely on the opinion of people influenced by ancient precedent and example. It was not supported either by money or force of arms; and, for this reason, we need not wonder that the Princes of that line were so extremely jealous of their prerogative; being sensible that when those claims were ravished from them, they possessed no influence by which they could maintain their dignity, or support the laws." —Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VI. p. 162.

PAGE 37.—*Locke's sentiments on the necessity of frequent Parliaments.*

These are the wise and constitutional sentiments of Mr. Locke on the necessity and importance of frequent Parliaments:—"The power of assembling and dismissing the legislative, placed in the executive, gives not the executive a superiority over it, but is a fiduciary trust placed in him for the safety of the people, in a case where the uncertainty and variableness of human affairs could not bear a steady, fixed rule. For it not being possible that the first framers of the government should, by any foresight, be so much masters of future events as to be able to prefix so just periods of return and duration to the assemblies of the legislature, in all times to come, that might exactly answer all the exigencies of the commonwealth; the best remedy that could be found for this defect was to trust this to the prudence of one who was always to be present, and whose business it was to watch over the public good. Constant, frequent meetings of the legislative, and long continuations of their assemblies, without necessary occasion, could not but be burthensome to the people, and must necessarily, in time, produce more dangerous inconveniences, and yet the quick turn of affairs might be sometimes such as to need their present help; any delay of their convening might endanger the public; and sometimes too their business might be so great that the limited time of their sitting might be too short

for their work, and rob the public of that benefit which could be had only from their mature deliberation. What, then, could be done in this case to prevent the community from being exposed, some time or other, to imminent hazard, on one side or other by fixed intervals and periods, set to the meeting and acting of the legislative, but to entrust it to the prudence of some, who being present and acquainted with the state of public affairs, might make use of this prerogative for the public good? And where else could this be so well placed as in his hands, who was entrusted with the execution of the laws for the same end? Thus, supposing the regulation of times for the assembling and sitting of the legislative, not settled by the original constitution, it naturally fell into the hands of the executive; not as an arbitrary power, depending on his good pleasure, but with this trust, always to have it exercised only for the public weal, as the occurrences of time, and change of affairs might require."—Locke, on Civil Government, vol. II. p. 218.

The most zealous partisans of Charles must allow, therefore, that the constitution was brought into imminent danger, "when (in the language of Bolingbroke) Parliaments were laid aside," when the very mention of them was forbid, "and he continued to govern without any for twelve years."

PAGE 38.—*Defence of Locke.*

It is, I know not how, the fashion of the day to treat Mr. Locke as a republican writer, and in con-

sequence of this absurd prejudice, his character has been unjustly exalted and depressed, and his works either totally neglected, or unprofitably read. So rooted is my own dislike to the cause of republicanism in this kingdom, and so great are my fears from the intolerant and ferocious spirit of many among its advocates, that I should be sorry to see either their reasonings supported, or their designs forwarded by the authority of so illustrious a name. Such, too, is my veneration for the sagacity and the uprightness of Locke, that I should blush to find him degraded into the abject character of a mere partisan, contracting those views which ought to embrace the collective interests of the species into the narrow compass of a faction, and contending exclusively for *one* mode of government, which is equally liable with all other forms, to fatal abuse, which is utterly incompatible with the civil and the military genius of many civilized nations, and which is evidently adverse to the *manners* and to the *laws* of *this* country. I cannot, therefore, persuade myself to look at this excellent person in a point of view where he has been unfortunately misplaced by the intemperate zeal of party, by the crude and hasty misconceptions of his friends, and by the insidious or malignant misrepresentations of his enemies. His celebrated Essay upon Government I have repeatedly perused with the calmest, the most impartial, and severe attention. While I feel myself compelled to dissent from some parts, and while I lament that others, to which I assent most sincerely, are liable to be perverted by ignorant and factious men,

I think the whole work, fairly considered, inimitable and unanswerable. To his observations on the rights of mankind, and the origin of society, I have hitherto met with no *full* and *direct* reply. The Dean of Gloucester, to whose vigorous mind and correct information I am indebted for much instruction upon more *confined* subjects of policy, has, in a very unprovoked and unjustifiable attack upon Mr. Locke, indulged himself in captious and verbal cavils. Hume, in his Essay upon the Origin of Government, seems to mistake the question, so far, at least, as Mr. Locke is concerned; for he confounds the narrow views of the vulgar, and their mechanical submission to the laws of a state in which they are accidentally born, with the researches of philosophers into those remoter principles from which the first governments took their rise, and by which alone the utility of all governments, in their higher stage of improvement is to be ascertained, or their compulsory power justified.

Now the professed and supreme object of the essay in question is to trace out those principles. It contains not, so far as I can discover, any lurking bias in favour of democracy. By good *men* it may be applied to good *ends* in the mixed constitution in which we have the happiness to live. In a word, it is equally removed from the extremes of despotism and anarchy; equally exempt from the puerile sophistry of Filmer, and the romantic speculations of Harrington. In support of this assertion, I call upon those who traduce, and those who commend Locke for his supposed attachment to republican-

ism, to read the following passage:—"That learned king (James) who well understood the notions of things, makes the difference between a king and a tyrant to consist in this: that one makes the laws the bounds of his power, the good of the public; the other makes all give way to his own will and appetite."

"It is a mistake to think this fault is *proper only* to monarchies; *other* forms of government are liable to it, as well as that; for wherever the power that is put in any hands, for the government of the people, and the preservation of their properties, is applied to other ends, and made use of to impoverish, harass, or subdue them to the arbitrary and irregular commands of those that have it; there it presently becomes tyranny, whether those that use it are *one*, or *many*. Thus we read of the thirty tyrants at Athens, as well as one at Syracuse, and the intolerable dominion of the Decemvirs at Rome was nothing better."—Locke, upon Civil Government, vol. II. page 232.

As I shall hereafter have occasion to quote the sentiments of Mr. Locke upon other subjects, I thought it incumbent on me to remove every prejudice which might hang on the mind of the reader—to vindicate the injured character of a man eminent for his wisdom and his virtue, is always a pleasant task—my pleasure is increased by the honourable testimony borne by the learned Blackstone to the merit of a work which men of coarse understandings have grossly misconceived, and men of fiery tempers have unhappily misrepresented.—

In vol. I. page 252, Blackstone quotes with approbation Mr. Locke's Definition of Prerogative. In page 434 of the 4th volume, he tells us, "that the rude sentiments of our forefathers in defending the particular liberty, the natural equality and personal independence of individuals have been softened and recommended by the eloquence, the moderation, and the arguments of a Sidney, a Locke, and a Milton."—Milton indeed was a professed advocate for the republican system. The sentiments of Sidney strongly favour it. Locke, who was a better philosopher than Sidney, and a better citizen than Milton, has preserved a strict neutrality between the contending claims of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy.

PAGE 40.—*Introduction of Liturgy in Scotland.*

"The King's great aim was to complete the work so happily begun by his father; to establish discipline upon a regular system of canons, to introduce liturgy into public worship, and to render the ecclesiastical government of all his kingdoms regular and uniform. Some views of policy might move him to this undertaking: but his chief motives were derived from mistaken principles of zeal and conscience."—Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VI. page 326.

From the serenity of the times, from the approbation given to Laud's sermon, and from the weakness of the party who were averse to the measure, (as Clarendon tells us) "many wise men thought the liturgy, if proposed, would have been submitted to without opposition, had not they who most de-

sired, and were most concerned to promote it, used all their credit to divest their present attempting it."—Clarendon's Hist., vol. I. page 83.

But the most powerful obstructions were those which Hume points out.—"The Scotch, when a whole body of ecclesiastical laws was established without any previous consent of church or state, dreaded, lest by a parity of reason, like arbitrary authority, from like pretences and principles, would be assumed in civil matters. The liturgy had been sent to them with a few alterations, lest a servile imitation should shock the pride of Charles's ancient people; but the English, though separated from Rome, were thought still to retain a great tincture of the primitive pollution."—Hume, vol. VI. page 328.

PAGE 41.—*Re-assembling of Parliament in* 1640.

"An English Parliament, therefore, formerly so unkind and untractable, must now, after above eleven years intermission, after the King had tried many irregular methods of taxation, after multiplied disgusts given to the puritanical party, be summoned to assemble, amidst the most pressing necessities of the Crown."—Hume, vol. VI. 347. Intempestivis remediis delicta accendebat.—Tacit. vol. III. page 90, Annal. lib. XII.

"If some passion had appeared in their debates. it might have been well excused in a House of Commons assembled at such a time; and yet scarce an angry word was thrown out. The few that

escaped from some, were either silently disliked, or openly disapproved. The King, even in this crisis of affairs, preserved the same carriage he had formerly used towards them, and showed too plainly that he regarded them only as tax-layers. In a word, about a month after their meeting, he dissolved them, and as soon as he had dissolved them he repented; but he repented too late of his rashness. Well might he repent, for the vessel was now full, and this last drop made the waters of bitterness overflow."—Bolingbroke, vol. II. page 274.

The motives for which Charles summoned his Parliaments, and the manner in which they acted, remind me of Tacitus's observation—ut evenit in consiliis infelicibus, optima videbantur, quorum tempus effugerat. Histor. lib. I. — Hume, after stating the motives and the arguments of both parties with great clearness and energy, concludes in these words :—" Where great evil lies on all sides, it is very difficult to follow the best counsel; nor is it any wonder that the King, whose capacity was not equal to situations of such extreme delicacy, should hastily have formed and executed the resolution of dissolving this Parliament: a measure, however, of which he soon repented, and which the subsequent events, more than any convincing reason, inclined every one to condemn. The last Parliament which had ended with such rigour and violence, had yet, at first, covered their intentions with greater appearances of moderation than this Parliament had hitherto assumed."—Hume, vol. VI. page 355.

Hume, in a note informs us, that "the King meant to try whether this House would be more compliant than their predecessors, that he would not trust them with a long session, till he had seen some better proofs of their compliance: A sentiment," he adds, "natural enough in his situation." Hume, vol. VI. page 354.—But this apology is very inadequate and frivolous. It is natural, I allow, for men to act weakly—it is natural for them to shrink from the consequences of their own weakness; but in questions of such magnitude as include the interests of a King and his people, we are apt to inquire not what it is *natural*, but what it is *fitting* for men to do. By obstinately *forbearing* to call a Parliament, Charles had brought himself into a dangerous situation, and he increased the danger by abruptly dissolving that which he *had* called. Far be it from me to insult the memory of this unfortunate Prince—I see with pleasure every candid extenuation of his real failings, and every well-founded plea for his seeming misconduct: But I cannot permit my understanding to be insulted, and the rights of my country trifled with, by such futile reasoning as Hume has condescended to employ.

PAGE 42.—*Assembly of Peers at York.*

"Before the Peers met he knew they would be for calling a Parliament, and so, for his own honour, proposed it first.—Rapin.—Hume gives the same account.—As he foresaw that the great council of

the Peers would advise him to call a Parliament, he told them, in his first speech, he had already taken this resolution."—Hume, vol. VI. page 363.

PAGE 43.—*Long Parliament.*

This praise (that such representatives were chosen as were eminent for their ability, courage, and firm attachment to the privileges of the subject) cannot be given to all the members or to all the measures of the long Parliament—"law and religion had in a great measure gone over to the side of faction, and when the nation, therefore, was so generally discontented, and little suspicion was entertained of any design to subvert the church and monarchy, no wonder that almost all elections ran in favour of those who, by their high pretensions to piety and patriotism, had encouraged the national prejudices."—Hume, vol. VI. page 366.

In drawing up the character of this Parliament, our historian has shewn his usual penetration, and a very unusual degree of candour.—"If we take a survey of the transactions of this memorable Parliament, during the first period of its operations, we shall find, that, excepting Strafford's attainder, which was a complication of cruel iniquity, their merits, in other respects, so much outweigh their mistakes, as to entitle them to praise from all lovers of liberty. Not only were former abuses remedied and grievances redressed: great provision, for the future, was made by law, against the return of like complaints. And if the means, by which they ob-

tained such advantages, savour often of artifice, sometimes of violence, it is to be considered, that revolutions of government cannot be effected by the mere force of argument and reasoning: and that factions being once excited, men can neither so firmly regulate the tempers of others, nor their own, as to ensure themselves against all exorbitancies." —Hume, vol. VI. page 424.

"This was the time, when genius and capacity of all kinds, freed from the restraint of authority, and nourished by unbounded hopes and projects, began to exert themselves, and to be distinguished by the public."—Hume, vol. VI. page 377.—He proceeds to discriminate with the nicest precision, and to describe with the most glowing eloquence, the characters of the malecontents.—"Charles, (says De Lolme) had to cope with a whole nation put in motion and directed by an assembly of statesmen." —De Lolme, page 49.

"When he had consented to reduce the exorbitancy of the regal power, his conduct created a suspicion of his sincerity."—Stuart's Disc. on the Laws and Gov. of Eng. page 29.

"It must be acknowledged that these concessions were not made with so good a grace as to conciliate the confidence of the people. Unfortunately, either by his own mismanagement, or by the arts of his enemies, the King had lost the reputation of sincerity; which is the *greatest* misfortune that can befal a Prince."—Blackstone's Com. book IV. page 437.

Charles experienced the ill fate which Tacitus with his usual conciseness and energy thus describes: —"Inviso semel principe, seu benè seu malè facta premunt."—Tac. Histor. lib. I. vol. IV. page 15. Ed. Brot.

"The King's discourse and conduct betrayed his secret designs; distrust took possession of the nation; certain ambitious persons availed themselves of it to promote their own views, and the storm which seemed to have blown over, burst forth anew." De Lolme, on the Constit. of Eng. page 52.—Even Hume allows that all Charles's concessions were poisoned by the suspicion of his want of cordiality. —Hume, vol. VI. page 421.

PAGE 45.—*Earl of Strafford.*

The rude clamours of the people, and the insolent demands of the Parliament, unfortunately acquired new force over the mind of Charles, from the mean obsequiousness of his servants, and the pressing supplications of his beloved Queen. Let it not be forgotten, that "the memory of this guilt recurred upon Charles even at his own fatal end — and that he always expressed for it the greatest sorrow and remorse."

"The sentence by which Strafford fell was a great enormity"—but *not*, surely, "*greater* than the worst of those which his implacable enemies prosecuted with so much cruel industry."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 420.

Hume, the professed apologist for Strafford, contends that the "King's violent expedients for raising money was the result of measures previous to Strafford's favour; that they were conducted without his counsel; that in the King's presence he had often and publicly inculcated this salutary maxim, that if any inevitable necessity ever obliged the Sovereign to violate the laws, this licence ought to be practised with *extreme reserve*, and, as soon as possible, a just atonement be made to the constitution for any injury which it might sustain from such dangerous precedents."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 421.

PAGE 45.—*Archbishop Laud.*

"The execution of this prelate can be ascribed to nothing but vengeance and bigotry; the degree of his merit may be disputed. If he did recommend slavish doctrines, if he promoted what in these later ages would be justly called persecution, if he encouraged what in some instances has been unjustly called superstition, these blemishes are more to be regarded as a general imputation on the whole age, than any particular failing of Laud's; and it is sufficient for his vindication to observe, that his errors were the most excusable of all those which prevailed during that zealous period."—Hume, vol. VII. p. 42.—To imitate his faults were indeed a reproach to the present age, when the doctrines of toleration are fully known, and when the provocations to intolerance have totally ceased. But it were not a less reproach for us to forget the virtues of this great

prelate; his eminent proficiency in learning, his disinterested zeal in promoting it, his unshaken attachment to a master whom he loved, and his sincere, though mistaken ardour in defending the religion which he believed and revered—

> "Around his tomb let art and genius weep,
> But hear his death, ye blockheads, hear, and sleep."
>
> JOHNSON.

PAGE 46.—*Long Parliament.*

"Happy had been the people if their leaders, after having executed so noble a work, (settling the government upon its ancient foundations) had contented themselves with the glory of being the benefactors of their country."—De Lolme, p. 52.

"The attempt of totally annihilating monarchical power, was a very blameable extreme; especially as it was attended with the danger, to say the least, of a civil war, which, besides the numberless ills attending it, exposed liberty to much greater perils than it could have incurred under the now limited authority of the King. But as these points could not be supposed so clear during the time as they are, or may be, at present; there are great reasons of alleviation for men who were heated by the controversy, or engaged in the action. And it is remarkable, that even at present (such is the force of party prejudices) there are few people who have coolness enough to see these matters in a proper light."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 587.

"The encroachments of the Commons, though in the beginning less positive and determinate, are no less discernible by good judges, and were equally capable of destroying the just balance of the constitution."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 581.

"The majority of the Peers adhered to the King, and plainly foresaw the depression of nobility as a necessary consequence of popular usurpations on the crown. The wonder was not that the majority of the nobles should seek shelter under the throne, but that any of them should venture to desert it."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 461. — "The English nobility buried themselves with Charles the First, under the ruins of the throne." — See Montesq. book VIII. cap. IX.

"In their attack upon the hierarchy, they still more openly transgressed all bounds of moderation; as supposing, no doubt, that the sacredness of the cause would sufficiently atone for employing means the most irregular and unprecedented. This principle, which prevails so much among zealots, never displayed itself so openly, as during the transactions of this whole period."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 463.

"For a remedy to all these evils, he (the King) is desired to entrust every office and command to persons in whom his Parliament should have cause to confide. By this phrase, which is so often repeated in all the memorials and addresses of that time, the commons meant themselves and their adherents."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 384.

PAGE 47.—*Cavaliers and Roundheads.*

Hume gives this account of them: — "Several reduced officers and young gentlemen of the inns of court, during this time of disorder and danger, offered their service to the King. Between them and the populace there passed frequent skirmishes, which ended not without bloodshed. By way of reproach these gentlemen gave the rabble the appellation of *Roundheads*, on account of the short cropt hair which they wore; these called the others *Cavaliers*: and thus the nation, which was before sufficiently provided with religious as well as civil causes of quarrel, was also supplied with party-names, under which the factious might rendezvous and signalize their mutual hatred."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 466.

PAGE 48.—*Whigs.*

"Rapin, by mistake, says, they were so called from certain robbers in Scotland, but Burnett tells us the name is derived from the word *whiggam*, used by the western Scots in driving their horses, from whence these drivers were called *whigganers*, and by contraction *whigs*."—Tindal.

PAGE 48.—*Whig and Tory.*

Hume says, "This year (1679) is remarkable for being the epoch of the well known epithets of *Whig* and *Tory*, by which, and sometimes without any ma-

terial difference, this island has been so long divided. The court party reproached their antagonists with their affinity to the fanatical conventiclers in Scotland who were known by the name of Whigs; the country party found a resemblance between the courtiers and the popish banditti in Ireland, to whom the appellation of Tory was affixed—and after this manner, these foolish terms of reproach came into public and general use; and even at present, seem not nearer their end than when they were first invented." —Hume, vol. VIII. p. 125.

PAGE 50.—*Political and Religious Puritans.*

Hume makes this distinction: "Though the political and religious Puritans mutually lent assistance to each other, there were many who joined the former, and yet declined all connection with the latter."—Hume, vol. VI. p. 365.

PAGE 51.—*Death of Charles I.*

"The loans and benevolences extorted from the subject, the arbitrary imprisonments for refusal, the exertion of martial law in time of peace, and other domestic grievances, clouded the morning of that misguided Prince's reign; which, though the noon of it began a little to brighten, at last went down in blood."—Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. IV. p. 436, book IV. chap. 33.

The death of Charles has been described by royal and republican writers with all the studied pomp of

declamation, and all the virulence of party. The one speak of it with the most vehement execration, and the other with the most savage triumph. The one have left no artifice unemployed to excite our compassion towards an injured Prince — the other have been equally active and equally successful in rousing the indignation of their readers against an unprincipled tyrant. If we attend to the circumstances of this event, not as they are recorded by any single historian, but as the calm and impartial spirit of history requires, we shall find in those circumstances something, perhaps, to be justified, much to be condemned, *and far more to be lamented.* "Adeo maxima quæque ambigua sunt, dum alii quoquo modo audita pro compertis habent, alii vera in contrarium vertunt: et gliscit utrumque posteritate." Tacit. Annal. lib. III. vol. I. p. 179.— About the justice of Charles's death, the sentiments of Englishmen will probably for ever be divided, nor is it easy to find any common principle for reconciling disputants, who, when they speak upon this subject, are actuated by the fiercest passions, and the most stubborn prejudices. But surely no friend to humanity, no admirer of the English constitution, no advocate for the candour which always ought to direct historical researches, will hesitate about the propriety of Bolingbroke's observations on the disastrous reigns of Charles and his Father.—"We do not approve those cruel insinuations against them which are to be found in several invectives, not histories, dictated by a spirit of faction, not by the spirit of liberty. *The spirit of liberty reflects on*

the errors of Princes with sorrow, not with triumph, and is unwilling to aggravate what it wishes had never happened."—Bolingbroke's Rem. on Hist. vol. II. p. 183.

Upon the disorders which succeeded the unhappy death of Charles, who can reflect without pity for the blindness of a deluded people, and detestation against the violence of their ambitious leaders ?

> Ergo, regibus occisis, subversa jacebat
> Pristina Majestas soliorum, et sceptra superba,
> Et capitis summi præclarum insigne *cruentum*
> Sub pedibus vulgi magnum lugebat honorem.
> *Nam cupidè conculcatur nimis antè metutum.*
> Res itaque ad summam fœcem turbasque redibat.
>
> Lucret. lib. quint. 1155.

PAGE 52.—*Elasticity of British Government.*

" Indeed we may observe the remarkable manner in which the government has been maintained, in the midst of such general commotions as seemed unavoidably to prepare its destruction. It rose again, we see, after the wars between Henry the Third and his Barons; after the usurpation of Henry the Fourth; and after the long and bloody contentions between the Houses of York and Lancaster. Nay, though totally destroyed in appearance after the fall of Charles the First, and though the greatest efforts had been made to establish another form of government in its stead, yet, no sooner was Charles the Second called over, than the constitution was re-established upon all its antient foundations."—De Lolme, on the Constit. of Eng. p. 434.

PAGE 53.—*Cromwell.*

"He introduced into England a military despotism under the appellation of a commonwealth." Stuart on the Govern. of Eng. p. 30.—I mean not to enter into any curious and fruitless disquisitions on the best hypothetical form of government; at the same time I am far from acquiescing in a well known, but very precarious maxim, that whatever form is best administered is therefore best. I consider with Tiberius, Principes mortales, rempublicam æternam esse. Annal. lib. III. Tacit. vol. I. p. 168. —"And I should be sorry, as Hume says, to think that human affairs admit of no greater stability than what they receive from the casual humours and characters of particular men." Essay III. p. 15.—But as to the absurd and perilous experiment of establishing republicanism in this kingdom, the gloomy and eventful protectorate of Cromwell supplies us with the most decisive proofs against the animated eloquence of Milton, the wild reveries of Harrington, and the profound speculations of Sidney. In the spirit of our laws, in the genius of our government, in the manners and the temper of our people, and in the spirit of the constitution itself, as it affects and is affected by each of them, there is a stubborn invincible renitency to the sullen and irregular forms of a democracy.—"It was a curious spectacle," says Montesquieu, as quoted by De Lolme, p. 53, "to behold the vain efforts of the English to establish among themselves a democracy."

"He was one of those men, quos vituperare ne inimici quidem possunt, nisi ut simul laudent; for he could never have done half that mischief without great parts of courage, industry, and judgment. What was said of Cinna, may very justly be said of him, ausum eum, quæ nemo auderet bonus, perfecisse quæ a nullo nisi fortissimo possent." Clarendon, vol. VI. p. 648.—"As he proceeded with this kind of indignation and haughtiness with those who were refractory and durst contend with his greatness, so towards all who complied with his good pleasure, and courted his protection, he used great civility, generosity, and bounty."—Id. 650.

But this conduct is to be ascribed to the dexterity of his management, rather than to any nobleness in his nature; for, without such policy, the most powerful despot could not be long endured. His brutal treatment of the Judges who opposed the authority of Magna Charta to the violence of his proceedings, and his avowed contempt of law, where it controled those actions, "which he knew were for the safety of the commonwealth," must induce the reader to exclaim with Memmius—quæ libet impune facere, id est regem esse.—Sallust, edit. Wasse, p. 318.

The anxious wishes of Cromwell to obtain the name of king, the various artifices which were employed to procure it, and the surly and inexorable opposition of those resolute republicans who prevented him from assuming it openly, are well known. Hurd, in his Letter on the Marks of Imitation, produces a very striking coincidence of sentiment be-

tween the conduct of Messala Valerius, when he moved in the Senate, renovandum per annos sacramentum in nomen Tiberii, and that of Jephson, when he proposed in the House that Cromwell should be made king.—Hurd's Horace, vol. II. p. 35.

The gross stupidity of the people, who could be duped by such petty stratagems, and crouch under such outrageous measures, reminds me of a passage in Plutarch, where he has been describing a similar scene, in which Cæsar repeatedly thrust aside the crown which Anthony repeatedly struggled to fix on his head. Ἀντωνίῳ μὲν ὀλίγοι τῶν φίλων βιαζομένῳ, Καίσαρι δὲ ἀρνουμένῳ πᾶς ὁ δῆμος ἐπεκράτει μετὰ βοῆς· ὃ καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἦν, ὅτι τοῖς ἔργοις τὰ τῶν βασιλευόντων ὑπομένοντες, τοὔνομα τοῦ βασιλέως, ὡς κατάλυσιν τῆς ἐλευθερίας, ἔφευγον.

His conduct supplies a fresh instance of the justness of Piso's observation—"Nemo unquam imperium, flagitio quæsitum, bonis artibus exercuit."—Tacit. vol. IV. p. 36.

"Cæterum libertas et speciosa nomina prætexuntur; nec quisquam alienum servitium, et dominationem sibi concupivit, ut non eadem ista vocabula usurparet."—Vid. Tac. Histor. lib. IV. vol. IV. p. 362.

PAGE 54.—*General Monk.*

"The minds of the people united in an anxious wish for the re-establishment of the ancient constitution; and General Monk acquired the honour of

the peerage, and the fame of uncommon political sagacity for forwarding an event which it was impossible to prevent."—Stuart on Govern. of Eng. p. 30.

PAGE 55.—*Charles the Second.*

The indolence of Charles, and his unhappy choice of counsellors, reminds us of the strong colouring with which Tacitus has drawn the character of Vitellius—"Peritissimis centurionum dissentientibus, et, si consulerentur, vera dicturis, arcuere eos intimi amicorum Vitellii, ita formatis principis auribus, ut aspera, quæ utilia, nec quidquam, nisi jucundum et læsurum acciperet."—Tacit. Histor. lib. III. vol. IV. p. 246.

PAGE 55.—*Conduct of Cromwell.*

Hume explains the conduct of Cromwell by saying, that the various factions could not have been restrained without a mixture of military and arbitrary authority. But surely if this judicious observation be admitted as an apology for the violent behaviour of Cromwell, it makes us look with greater horror upon those distractions of the kingdom which rendered such a behaviour necessary.

PAGE 56.—*Bolingbroke's state of parties in the reign of Charles II.*

I entirely agree with Bolingbroke in his clear and

orrect state of parties during the reign of Charles. Whig and Tory were now formed into parties; ut I think they were not now, nor at any other me, what they believed one another, nor what they ave been represented by their enemies, nay, by ieir friends. The Whigs were not Roundheads, iough the measures they pursued being stronger ian the temper of the nation would then bear, gave ccasion to the suspicions I have mentioned. The ories were not Cavaliers, though they took the arm so sudden and so warm for the church and ie King; and though they carried the principles i favour of the King, at least while the heat of ieir contests with the opposite party lasted, higher ian they had ever been carried before. The Whigs ere not dissenters, nor republicans, though they ivoured the former, and though some inconsider-ble remains of the latter might find shelter in their arty. The Tories had no disposition to become aves or Papists, though they abetted the exercise f an exorbitant power by the crown, and though ey supported the pretensions of a Popish succes-or to it."—Boling. Dissert. on Part. vol. III. p. 93.

PAGE 56.—*Charles the Second.*

Rapin, it may be suspected, speaks rather too ivourably of Charles; he "probably forgave the eople of England for the misfortunes he himself ad suffered, nor for those of his house."—Stuart on ie Govern. of Eng. p. 31.—De Lolme is of the ime opinion—"He could not, however, bring him-

self to forgive them the inexpiable crime of which he looked upon them to have been guilty."—De Lolme on the Constitut. of Eng. p. 54.

"King Charles, to use an expression of the Lord Halifax of that age, would trot, but his brother would gallop."—Bolingbroke's Dissert. on Part. vol. III. p. 67.

"An apprehension of falling back under the influence of presbyterian and republican principles began to show itself in the House of Lords and in the nation."—Dissert. on Parties, vol. III. p. 86.

"If we may believe one (Burnett) who certainly was not partial against these sects, both presbyterians and independents had carried the principles of rigour, in the point of conscience, much higher, and acted more implacably upon it than ever the Church of England hath done, in its angriest fits. The securing themselves, therefore, against those who had ruined them and the constitution once already, was a plausible reason for the church party to give."—Boling. Dissert. on Part. vol. III. p. 55.

"The act against conventicles bears the appearance of mitigating the former persecuting laws; but if we may judge by the spirit which had broken out almost every session during this Parliament, it was not intended as any favour to the non-conformists. Experience probably had taught that laws over rigid and severe could not be executed."—Hume, Hist. of Eng. vol. VII. p. 456.

PAGE 58.—*Exclusion Bill.*

"This important bill, which implied banishment as well as exclusion, passed the lower House by a majority of seventy-nine."—Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VIII. p. 104.

But the Whigs were also to be blamed, (as well as Tories,) for the leaders of that party were observed "to let all lie in confusion, rather than hearken to any thing besides the exclusion."—Bol. Dis. upon Part. vol. III. p. 115

"The Tories, who looked on the dangers they apprehended from the Whigs to be greater and nearer than those which they had apprehended, as well as the Whigs, before this new division of parties from a Popish succession, were now confirmed in their prejudices. Under this persuasion they ran headlong in all the measures which were taken for enlarging the King's authority, and securing the crown to the Duke of York. The principles of divine hereditary right, of passive obedience, and non-resistance, were revived and propagated with greater zeal than ever. Not only the wild whimsies of enthusiasts, of schoolmen and philosophers, but the plainest dictates of reason were solemnly condemned in favour of them by learned and reverend bodies of men; who little thought that in five years time, that is, in 1688, they should act conformably to some of the very propositions which at this time they declared false, seditious, and impious."—Boling. Dissert. upon Parties.

PAGE 60.—*Amendment of laws under Charles II.*

Blackstone informs us, that the most promising and sensible schemes for the amendment of the laws which were proposed during the protectorate, were adopted after the restoration—"in his reign (wicked, sanguinary, and turbulent, as it was) the concurrence of happy circumstances was such, that from thence we may date not only the re-establishment of our church and monarchy, but also the complete restitution of English liberty, for the first time, since the total abolition at the conquest. For therein not only these slavish tenures, the badge of foreign dominion, with all their oppressive appendages, were removed from incumbering the estates of the subject; but also an additional security of his person from imprisonment, was attained by that great bulwark of our constitution, the *habeas corpus* act."—Blackstone, vol. IV. book IV. p. 438.

"The military services due to the crown, the remains of the ancient feudal tenures, had been already abolished; the laws against heretics were now repealed; the statute for holding Parliaments once, at least, in three years, was enacted; the habeas corpus act, that barrier of the subject, was established; and such was the patriotism of the Parliaments, that it was under a King the most destitute of principle, that liberty received its most efficacious supports."—De Lolme on the Constit. of Eng. p. 55.

James II.

"The sincerity of this Prince (a virtue on which

he highly valued himself) has been much questioned in those reiterated promises, which he made of preserving the liberties and religion of the nation. It must be confessed that this reign was almost one continued invasion of both."—Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VIII. p. 304.

The arguments for and against dispensing power are admirably stated by Hume, vol. VIII. p. 243 to 247. In delivering his own opinions, he says, that "the present difficulty or seeming absurdity had proceeded from late innovations introduced into the government"—he treats it as a vain hope to expect "that the dispensing power could, in any degree, be rendered compatible with those accurate and regular limitations, which had of late been established, and which the people was determined to maintain."—P. 247.

In this unhappy Prince we see the rashness, but not the profligacy of Domitian.—"Non jam per intervalla sed continuo et velut uno ictu rempublicam exhausit."—Tac. vol. VI. p. 92.

"*The dissenters were cajoled by the court*; and they who had been ready to take up arms against King Charles, because he was unwilling to exclude his brother, and who had taken up arms against this Prince, since he was on the Throne, became abettors of his usurpations, It were easy to prove this, even by Bishop Burnet's account, as much as that is softened; and if the excuses

which have been made for their silence against Popery, in this critical moment, or for their approving the exercise of a dispensing power, are to be received, one may undertake to excuse, on the same principle of reasoning, all those instances of misconduct in the church party which I have presumed to censure so freely."—Boling. Dissert. upon Parties, vol. III. p. 120.

PAGE 63.—*Opposition to James II.*

"Many of the most distinguished Tories, some of those who carried highest the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance, were engaged in it, and the whole nation was ripe for it. The Whigs were zealous in the same cause, but their zeal was not such as I think it had been some years before, a zeal without knowledge; I mean, that it was better tempered and more prudently conducted. Though the King was not the better for his experience, parties both saw their errors. The Tories stopped short in the pursuit of a bad principle. The Whigs reformed the abuse of a good one. Both had sacrificed their country to their party. Both sacrificed on this occasion their party to their country."—Boling. Dissert. on Parties, vol. III. p. 120.

"The Whigs, suitably to their ancient principles of liberty, which had led them to attempt the exclusion bill, easily agreed to oppose a King, whose conduct had justified whatever his worst enemies had prognosticated concerning his succession. The

Tories and the church party, finding their past services forgotten, their rights invaded, their religion threatened, agreed to drop for the present all overstrained doctrines of submission, and attend to the great and powerful dictates of nature. The non-conformists dreading the caresses of known and inveterate enemies, deemed the offers of toleration more secure from a Prince educated in those principles, and accustomed to that practice—and thus all faction was for a time laid asleep in England; and rival parties, forgetting their animosities, had secretly concurred in a design of resisting their unhappy and misguided Sovereign."—Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VIII. p. 282.

PAGE 64.—*Revolution.*

"The Lords considered the word *deserted* more proper; and on the subsequent conference between the two Houses, the Whigs, now the ruling party, having united with the Tories, in order to bring about the Revolution, had so much deference for their new allies, as not to insist that the Crown should be declared *forfeited*, on account of the King's mal-administration."—Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VIII. p. 312.—These disputes were perhaps trifling, and the effects of insidious politeness and temporary policy. But the contents relative to the vacancy of the Throne were of more importance: the artificial maxims of law here gave way to the powerful dictates of nature—the rigid perseverance of the Commons prevailed over the ill-timed deli-

cacy of the Lords, and the Throne was declared vacant. Blackstone states this fact with great precision. "In particular it is worthy observation, that the convention, in this their judgement, avoided with great wisdom the wild extremes into which the visionary theories of some zealous republicans would have led them. They held that this misconduct of King James amounted to an *endeavour* to subvert the constitution; and not to an actual subversion, or total dissolution of the government, according to the principles of Mr Locke, which would have reduced the society almost to a state of nature—would have levelled all distinctions of honour, rank, offices, and property—would have annihilated the sovereign power, and in consequence have repealed all positive laws—and would have left the people at liberty to have erected a new system of state upon a new foundation of polity. They therefore very prudently voted it to amount to no more than an abdiction of the government, and a consequent vacancy of the Throne; whereby the government was allowed to subsist, though the executive magistrate was gone, and the kingly office to remain, though James was no longer King; and thus the constitution was kept intire: which upon every sound principle of government must otherwise have fallen to pieces, had so principal and constituent a part as the royal authority been abolished, or even suspended."—Blackstone, vol. I. chap. III. p. 212.

"In the House of Lords it was agreed to omit the article about the vacancy of the Crown, but

the perseverance of the lower House obliged the Lords to comply."—Hume, vol. VIII. p. 314.

On the position of Locke, which Blackstone mentions, I wish to make a few remarks. There is a very common, but delusive maxim, that what is true and just in theory, may be the very reverse in practice. In the first place, theory is, or ought to be, itself, posterior to practice, and dependent upon it, arranging past facts according to their causes, circumstances, and effects, marking their differences and agreements, and thence deducing principles for the judgement we are to form of the future; so that all theory, not professedly hypothetical is false and unjust, so far as it does not correspond with practice. We may farther observe, that the position itself involves a gross contradiction; for, if the circumstances be the same, the relations between our ideas, from which we collect the fitness and unfitness of things, and the truth or falsehood of propositions, must be the same also, and so far the maxim is absurd as well as untrue; but if the circumstance be not the same, that is, if the objects of theory and practice be different, the maxim is quite impertinent and useless; for in this case, there is no bond of relation between them, and consequently no room for us to argue from the one to the other. I am inclined, however, to suspect, that for this and almost every other position commonly received and commonly misunderstood, there is some foundation. It is the business of theory to lay down general rules; but in the application of those rules to subjects which have *general fea-*

tures of resemblance, they are experimentally found inadequate, from *circumstances* which are attached to each individual case, and which are not accounted for by the general rules. Hence our common sense is often shocked, when we would reduce to practice many specious systems, by which our fancy has been amused, and our reason, *for a time*, convinced. Now according to the distinction which I have been endeavouring to establish, I admit with Mr. Locke in some *supposed* state of things, "that when he who has the supreme executive power neglects and abandons that charge, so that the laws already made can no longer be put in execution, this is demonstratively to reduce all to anarchy, and so effectually to dissolve the government."—I allow farther, as the obvious and necessary consequences of such a dissolution, that "the people are at liberty to provide for themselves, by erecting a new legislative different from the other, by the change of persons, or form, or both, as they shall find it most for their safety and good." —Locke on Civil Govern. p. 237.—But I deny, that *such* a state of things *actually* existed at the Revolution. Our countrymen were led to no such conclusions, as Mr. Locke has drawn from his premises, by their understanding or their feelings—they exposed neither themselves nor their posterity to the disorders which might have attended the success, as well as the defeat of an experiment to establish a new Government—they were content to preserve, as far as possible, the forms, to secure the principles, and to enlarge the advantages, of the

old—they acted wisely for themselves, happily for all succeeding generations, and agreeably to those propensities, which a great and sagacious observer of human nature has remarked: "even as the many, through the difference of opinions that must need abound among them, are not apt to introduce a government, as not understanding the good of it, so the many, having by trial or experience once attained to this understanding of it, agree not to quit such a government."—See Machiavel, lib. I. chap. I. of the Decads, quoted by Harrington, in his Art of Law-giving, p. 390.—Thus our countrymen, instead of yielding themselves up to the enterprizing and ambitious leaders, who (as Blackstone, vol IV. p. 438, says) in turbulent times affect to "call themselves *the people*," confided in the wisdom and steadiness of the legislature—instead of exposing themselves to new dangers, they were anxious only to escape from such as were already impending—they did not contend that the abuse of power in one part of government had loosened the whole fabric, and therefore called aloud for a change of the whole—on the contrary, they adopted the sentiments and assisted the efforts of Parliament, in securing the continuity of the executive power, and in strengthening the authority of the person to whom it was entrusted—they found that by well regulated measures "the laws already made" *could* be put in effectual execution, and consequently asserted "the native and original right which every society has of preserving itself," in obeying the ancient laws, in restoring the ancient government, in

correcting whatever was amiss in it, in ascertaining whatever was doubtful, and in confirming whatever was right. While, therefore, the patriot exults in the blessings which flow from this event, the philosopher will contemplate with admiration the sound judgement, the inflexible firmness, and the unexampled moderation which produced and conducted it.

"That which contributes, above all, to distinguish this event as singular in the annals of mankind, is the moderation, I may even say, the legality which accompanied it. As if to dethrone a King who sought to set himself above the laws had been a natural consequence of, and provided for by the principles of government, every thing remained in its place; the Throne was declared vacant, and a new line of succession was established."—De Lolme on the Constit. of Eng. p. 58.

"If we examine the history of other nations, we shall find that Revolutions have constantly been attended with open invasions of the royal authority, or sometimes with complete and settled divisions of it."—De Lolme on the Constit. of England, p. 399.—"In England the Revolution of the year 1689 was terminated in a manner totally different. Indeed, those prerogatives destructive of public liberty, which the late King had assumed, were retrenched from the Crown; and thus far the two Houses agreed: but as to proceeding to transfer to other hands any part of the authority of the Crown, no proposal was even made about it. Those prerogatives which were taken from the Crown,

were annihilated, and made to cease to exist in the state; and all the executive authority that was thought necessary to be continued in the government was, as before, left undivided in the Crown." —De Lolme on the Constit. of Eng. p. 402.

It is unnecessary for me to enter into a detail of the solid, and, I hope, permanent advantages which have resulted from the revolution; I shall content myself with these short quotations from Mr. De Lolme and Hume:—"The great charter had marked out the limits within which the royal authority ought to be confined; a few outworks were raised in the reign of Edward the First; but it was at the revolution that the circumvallation was compleated." —De Lolme on the Constit. of Eng. page 59.— "The whole scaffolding of false and superstitious notions, by which the royal authority had till then been supported, fell to the ground; and in the room of it were substituted the more solid and durable foundations of the love of order, and a sense of the necessity of civil government among mankind."— Page 60 of the same.

"It may justly be affirmed, without any danger of exaggeration, that we, in this island, have ever since enjoyed, if not the best system of government, at least the most entire system of liberty, that ever was known among mankind.—Hume, Hist. Eng. vol. VIII. page 318.

I would farther remark, that the same just notions of government, which then prevailed, have since been diffused more widely among us, that the doctrines of true liberty are *now* supported by the

testimony of experience, and that the spirit of licentiousness has not been rouzed by those provocations, which in the long struggles between freedom and prerogative were so frequent and so fatal —it therefore becomes us to forward the great work which our forefathers began, with the same discernment and activity in the pursuit of real improvement, the same manly contempt of speculative refinements, and the same zealous opposition to unnecessary, precipitate, and extravagant innovation.

Before I leave this subject, it is proper for me to mention a striking peculiarity in the history of our country—in "the public dissensions of other free states the interests of a few were provided for, but the grievances of the many seldom attended to." —"In England those dissensions have been terminated by extensive and accurate provisions for the general liberty." — What De Lolme, page 325, affirms, and by a long train of facts has proved, concerning all our revolutions, Hume confesses to be true of one. "It happens unluckily for those who maintain an original contract between the magistrate and the people, that great revolutions of government, and new settlements of civil constitutions, are commonly conducted with such violence, tumult, and disorder, that the public voice can scarcely ever be heard; and the opinions of the citizens are at that time less attended to than even in the common course of administration. The present transactions of England, it must be confessed, are a singular exception to this observation."— Hume, vol. VIII. page 314.

How far the general position tends to invalidate the original contract between the magistrate and the people, is a point of curiosity rather than of use. But the particular exception well deserves our notice. The wants of the people were redressed—their claims were admitted—their majesty, in the language of modern patriotism, was respected, for just and honourable reasons. At this awful crisis, their resentments were not wound up to an unnatural pitch—their complaints were extorted by real misery—and therefore they were both worthy of protection, and capable of receiving it, without any shock to the government, or any insult to the laws. Galled under the pressure of wrongs they had already experienced, and terrified with the prospect of greater mischiefs which they had yet to dread from the churlish bigotry and headstrong infatuation of their King, they boldly stood forth to shelter those rights, for which their fathers had so lately bled, from presumptuous violation. But the frightful convulsions to which they had been eye-witnesses in the reign of Charles, and the outrageous disorders which followed the usurpation of Cromwell, were still fresh in their memories, and deterred them from rushing again into the same licentiousness of anarchy, and the same frenzy of fanaticism. The higher orders of men were, also, at this juncture too much alarmed by *real and imminent evils*, to distress themselves, or to delude their inferiors, by inflammatory representations of those that were ideal or remote. From these events a very important lesson may be derived by persons,

who, from the eminence of their station, and the extent of their influence, are enabled to command the minds of the multitude—they will find that resistance is most successful when it is well-founded —that the passions of the people, in the prosecution even of the best purposes, should not be excited by artificial expedients, and that their concurrence is most effectual as well as most warrantable, when it springs from *sincere conviction that something ought to be done* for their relief, and is tempered by that good sense which is content with *doing enough.*

Every statesman who feels his own importance, and wishes to employ it for the welfare of the community, should remember the words of Scipio—"Multitudo omnis, sicut natura maris, per se immobilis est: venti et auræ cient. Ita aut tranquillum aut procellæ in populo sunt. Causa atque origo omnis furoris penes auctores est."—Lib. XXVIII. page 658, edit. Var.

This beautiful idea seems to be borrowed from the speech of Artabanus in Herodotus, *ἀνθρώπων κακῶν ὁμιλίαι σφάλλουσι· κατάπερ τὴν πάντων χρησιμωτάτην ἀνθρώποισι θάλασσαν, πνεύματα φασὶ ἀνέμων ἐμπίπτοντα, οὐ περιορῆν φύσει τῇ ἑωυτῆς χρῆσθαι.*—Herod. lib. VII. page 517. edit. Wess.

"When the revolution was secure, and these fears were calmed, these prejudices resumed, in some degree, their former power, and the more for being revived and encouraged by men of reputation and

authority, who argued for some, and might as reasonably have argued for all the errors, in contradiction to which most of them had acted, nay, and were ready to act. With such views and by such means were many brought, at this time, to entangle themselves in a maze of inextricable absurdities. Had they owned candidly and fairly, that their principles, as well as those of the Whigs, were carried too high in their former disputes of parties, and that these principles could not be true, since they found themselves actually in a situation wherein it was not possible to act agreeable to them without manifest absurdity, the distinction, as well as the difference of Whig and Tory had been at an end. But contrary measures produced a contrary effect—they kept up the appearances, and they could keep up no more, of a Whig and Tory party, and with these appearances a great part of the old animosity. The two names were sounded about the nation; and men who saw the same ensigns flying, were not wise enough to perceive, or not honest enough to own, that the same cause was no longer concerned; but listed themselves on either side, as their prejudices at first, and their inclinations or other motives, which arose in the progress of their contests, directed them afterwards; Whigs very often under the Tory standard; Tories very often under the Whig standard." — Bolingbroke's Dissert. on Parties, vol. III. page 130.

PAGE 69.—*Power of the Crown.*

When the aggregate expences of government are presented to us in one view, our imagination is assailed, and overwhelmed with their magnitude. After the burdensome taxes, and the calamitous events of the late war, the apprehensions of men upon this subject are too distressing to be sported with, and too just to be explained away. But to point out the particular manner, or the precise degree, in which those expences may be alleviated; to separate, in detail, the occasional from the permanent, and the useful from the superfluous; to stop the foul sources of corruption, without impeding the regular course of business, is an arduous task, which falls not within the reach of vulgar observation, or of abstract theory.

That task, however, will in all probability, be satisfactorily performed by the Commissioners of Accounts. The appointment of those Commissioners, was, indeed, a most honest and most judicious measure. It points, not, to vague surmises, but to real facts. It will scatter groundless complaints, and lead to the redress of those which are well founded. It is supported by the avowed approbation of all parties, but can promote the selfish designs of none. It tends to produce an extensive and effectual reform on principles of economy, and at the same time declines all disputable and invidious determinations on the very delicate, though interesting, question of influence.

Since the revolution, the places of government

have been considerably multiplied, and the strength of the Crown has been consequently augmented. The real exigencies of the state are, doubtless, more numerous; the candidates for its favours have been increased by the gradual reconciliation of those partizans who favoured the pretensions of the Stuart family; and, surely, it is neither absurd to suppose, nor indecent to assert, that the Crown has sought, in its influence, for some relief from the weakness which it felt under the diminution of its prerogative.

Mr. Hume tells us, "that the power of the Crown, by means of its large revenue, is rather upon the increase;" though, at the same time, he owns, "that its progress seems very slow, and almost insensible. The tide (says he) has run long, and with some rapidity, to the side of popular government, and is just beginning to turn towards monarchy."—Hume's Essays, vol. I. page 47.—But he would probably have retracted, or limited this opinion, if he had compared the influence of the Crown in the present reign with the open and shameless venality which prevailed during the administration of Walpole, or if he could have attended to many recent occurrences, in which the rights of the people have triumphed over supposed encroachments, and the efforts of the Commons have counteracted the projects of the Court. The Tories, no doubt, have their share, be it of merit, or demerit, in supporting the claims of the Crown. Yet, I know not, that their predecessors and rivals were more delicate in the mode of employing influence, more cautious

about extending it, or more upright in the choice of the measures it was employed to promote. The misconduct of James, probably, led the way to the more alarming errors of Charles. In the same manner the secret practices of the Whigs supplied the Tories with *precedents*, though not with *justifications*, for some illegal and dangerous expedients to which they had recourse. But the prerogative of the Crown was inactive upon these subjects—its influence was insufficient to stifle the complaints of the public, and we have been fortunate enough to find a remedy for many of the evils that were thought by some men to menace us, not in the headstrong violence of the people, but in the temperate resistance of the Commons, and in the firm and constitutional protection of the laws.

When a celebrated vote respecting influence lately passed the House of Commons, I confess fairly, that I approved of its principle; for the weight of that influence appeared to me (as it does to the author of the Dialogue on the actual State of Parliaments) "to predominate in the scale." Page 49.—The reader may recollect, that in page 20 of this work, I have produced some reasons, in order to show the unavoidable existence and occasional utility of some influence in the Crown. I am guilty of no inconsistency in saying, that I had been accustomed to think the present *degree* of that influence oppressive to the revenues and dangerous to the freedom of the state. Into this persuasion I was led, not by the clamours of the day, but by the general aspect of political causes through the pre-

ceding reigns, by the candid concessions of Blackstone himself, (vol. I. page 336, and vol. IV. page 441,) and by the respectable example of many dispassionate and judicious men, who then supported some measures of administration, which, with a sincere respect for many of the persons concerned in them, I could not approve.

> "Nec quemquam incuso. Potuit quæ plurima virtus
> Esse, fuit—toto certatum est corpore regni." Virg.

But on a comprehensive and more serious view of the question, upon summoning together some arguments, which I had totally overlooked, and more deeply examining others, which I had seen through a dim and distorted medium, I begin to think that the influence of the King is less formidable in *reality* than in appearance—that it produces many advantages and prevents many evils which escape superficial observers—that while it threatens freedom in one quarter, it gives an unseen but solid protection to it in another. The regal power, whether it arise from influence or prerogative, is scarce strong enough to support itself against the *latent* but *growing* strength—the undefined and perhaps undefinable privileges of the House of Commons. While, therefore, we rejoice in seeing the balance prevail in favour of the people, we act a wicked part in affecting to place the superiority *where it is not:* we act, also, an unwise part in augmenting the weight of it where, from a variety of causes known and unknown, temporary or permanent, it for some time has been, and is yet likely to be. I do not take upon myself to say

peremptorily that the hands of royal authority ought to be strengthened, nor would I rush into the perilous and invidious office of pointing out the methods by which an increase of strength may be conveyed to them, most consistently with the public good. Between powers, in the abuse of which the one may gradually undermine our rights, and the other crush them at a blow—between haughty and stubborn prerogative on the one hand, and an insinuating and encroaching influence on the other, the choice surely is big with difficulty and with danger. Perhaps they who are least able to examine the question, will be most forward to decide it. But I would be understood to speak without any harsh sentiments of those who differ from me, and with a sincere deference to the judgments of men, whose experience in the public business of the state gives them a deeper insight into the secret motives of mankind, and the relative energy of those causes which affect the happiness of the community, when I say that I find no *immediate* reason for lessening the influence of the Crown—that I see many reasons against contracting its power in one respect without enlarging it in another—that I perceive yet *more* reasons for abstaining from all experimental alterations whatsoever in the critical condition of our present affairs. On the whole, I wish, in the words of Hume, "to cherish and improve our ancient constitution, without encouraging a passion for such heretics" as have lately been recommended.

Let not these sentiments be imputed to that un-

feeling sluggishness which shrinks from the toil of every attempt to improve—to that blindness of judgment which confounds actual improvement with wanton charge—or to that false moderation which *affects* so to confound it. I allow with Lord Bacon, that "Time is the greatest innovator;" that "if time of course alter these things for the worse, wisdom and good counsel should alter them to the better," and that "a froward retention of custom is as turbulent a thing as sedition." But I *also* know from the respectable authority of the same writer, that "what is settled by custom, though it be not good, is therefore fit"—that "new things which help by their utility yet trouble by their inconformity"—and that "it highly becomes us to beware, lest, where the reformation should draw on the change, it be the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation."—I think not, nor am I acquainted with any judicious and impartial man, who professes to think, that our political concerns, either in system or detail, are *precisely as they ought to be.* I should rejoice in a fair opportunity of introducing some *well directed and well proportioned* alteration in the influence of the Crown, in the authority of the Parliament, and in the representation of the people. But I require the most unequivocal proofs, that a task so arduous in itself, and so interesting in its consequences, be undertaken by men of sagacity, who "understand the great secret of nature in the state as well as in health, that it is better to change many things than one," and not only to unite utility with conformity, but to educe the one from the

other—by men of moderation who "would follow the example of time itself, which innovateth greatly but quietly"—by men of stern and inflexible virtue, who preferring solid praise to transient popularity, "take care that the good be not taken away with the bad, which is commonly done when the people is the reformer."—See Bacon's Essays, No. 17. 24.

Men of the foregoing description, are not the produce of every day. They are seldom found among the ambitious leaders of a party, who for selfish purposes call aloud for changes, which perhaps they are neither willing to attempt nor able to conduct; and in vain shall we look for them among those restless and discontented spirits to whom the fine observation of Thucydides may be applied τὸ πάρον ἀεὶ βαρὺ τοῖς ὑπηκόοις. Page 53, edit. Duker. Whenever such men step forth, and bring with them clear pretensions to the confidence of the public, the good sense of that public will be at no loss to distinguish their qualifications, and the assistance of all worthy citizens will be vigorously and gratefully employed to give efficacy to their endeavours. If the moderate Whigs should have the merit of furnishing such reformers, we are encouraged by the experience of past ages to believe, that the moderate Tories will not have the demerit of opposing them. In the mean time, I hope that the strength of both will be centred in a vigilant and resolute opposition to every audacious empiric—to every crafty impostor—to a herd of men, who stun our ears with complaints of evils, which, if imaginary, they wish to exist, and if real, they have

been instrumental in creating, for the sake of gratifying their pride and of displaying their dexterity, in the application of precarious and desperate remedies.

From this tremendous charge I think it my duty to exempt the philosophical and benevolent, though visionary projects of a Jebb, the deeper and more instructive researches of a Price, and the hasty, but well-meant and ingenious effusions of a Priestley. Men of real parts and real integrity (as they are) illumine every subject on which they write, and enlarge knowledge where they do not impress conviction. Whatever they propose deserves to be maturely considered before it be rejected—they bring truth to a severer test than it has before undergone—they stir up an active spirit of emulation in political inquiry—and, at all events, they enable even a successful antagonist to understand his own opinions more clearly, to retain them more honourably, and to act from them with a steadier view to the public good.

There are some persons who possess the talents, but not the virtues of the men, whose names I have just now mentioned. These restless and ambitious spirits employ their imagination in framing new theories of government, their sophistry in explaining away the advantages of the present, and their eloquence in blinding the judgments and inflaming the passions of their fellow-citizens. The dazzling genius and incessant activity of such incendiaries are far more injurious to a state than the ignorance and even the errors of the lower orders of men

when left to the unbiassed direction of their own common sense.

Let me recommend to the serious perusal of such readers (for *some* of them *can* read) the following observations of Thucydides: *πάντων δὲ δεινότατον, εἰ βέβαιον ἡμῖν μηδὲν καθεστήξει ἂν ἀν δόξῃ περὶ—μηδὲ γνωσόμεθα ὅτι χείροσι νόμοις ἀκινήτοις χρωμένη πόλις κρείσσων ἐστὶν, ἢ καλῶς ἔχουσιν ἀκύροις· ἀμαθία τε μετὰ σωφροσύνης ὠφελιμώτερον, ἢ δεξιότης μετὰ ἀκολασίας —οἵ τε φαυλότεροι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρὸς τοὺς ξυνετωτέρους, ὡς ἐπιτοπλεῖστον ἄμεινον οἰκοῦσι τὰς πόλεις—οἱ μὲν γὰρ τῶν τε νόμων σοφώτεροι βούλονται φαίνεσθαι, τῶν τε ἀεὶ λεγομένων ἐς τὸ κοινὸν περιγίγνεσθαι, ὡς ἐν ἄλλοις μείζοσιν ἐκ ἂν δηλώσαντες τὴν γνώμην καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου τὰ πολλὰ σφάλλουσι τὰς πόλεις—οἱ δὲ ἀπιστοῦντες τῇ ἐξ αὐτῶν ξυνέσει, ἀμαθέστεροι μὲν τῶν νόμων ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι, ἀδυνατώτεροι δὲ τοῦ καλῶς εἰπόντος μέμψασθαι λόγον—κρίται δὲ ὄντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου μαλλὸν, ἢ ἀγωνισταὶ, ὀρθοῦνται τὰ πλεία—ὡς οὖν* ΧΡΗ ΚΑΙ ΥΜΑΣ *ποιοῦντας, μὴ δεινότητι καὶ ξυνέσεως ἀγῶνι ἐπαιρομένους, παρὰ δόξαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ πλήθει παραινεῖν.*—Page 188.

PAGE 74.—*William III.*

During the reign of William the attempts of Parliament to infringe on the constitution were foiled either by the good sense of the people at large, or by the jealousy of one branch of the legislature towards another. "There are instances where the House, even when in opposition to the Crown, has not been followed by the people, as we may particularly observe of the Tory House of Commons in

the reign of King William."—Hume's Essays, vol. I. p. 34, Essay IV.

"In the reign of King William the Third, a few years after the Revolution, attacks were made upon the Crown from another quarter. A strong party was formed in the House of Lords, and, as we may see in Bishop Burnet's History of his own Times, they entertained very deep designs. One of their views, among others, was to abridge the prerogative of the Crown of calling Parliaments, and judging of the proper times of doing it. They accordingly framed and carried in their House a bill for ascertaining the sitting of Parliament every year; but the bill, after it had passed in their House, was rejected in the House of Commons."—De Lolme on Constitution of England, p. 397.

"There was another party directly opposite to this; a certain number of men, on whom the original taint, transmitted down from King James the First, remained still in the full strength of its malignity. These men adhered to those principles, in the natural sense and full extent of them, which the Tories had possessed."—Bolingb. Dissert. upon Parties, vol. III. p. 132.

"The Tories had no longer any pretence of fearing the designs of the Whigs, since the Whigs had sufficiently purged themselves from all suspicion of republican views by their zeal to continue monarchical government, and of latitudination schemes in point of religion, by their ready concurrence in preserving our ecclesiastical establishment, and by their insisting on nothing farther, in favour of Dis-

senters, than that indulgence which the church was most willing to grant. The Whigs had as little pretence of fearing the Tories, since the Tories had purged themselves, in the most signal manner, from all suspicion of favouring Popery, or arbitrary power, by the vigorous resistance they made to both. They had engaged, they had taken the lead in the revolution, and they were fully determined against the return of King James."—Vid. Boling. Dissert. upon Parties, vol. III. p. 128.

If the future conduct of those persons (Republican Whigs) may be conjectured with any probability from that of their forefathers, we may, without any violation of candour, apply to them the words of Tacitus: "Ista secta Tuberones, et Favonios, veteri quoque reipublicæ ingrata nomina, genuit. Ut imperium evertant, libertatem præferunt; si perverterint, libertatem ipsam aggredientur."—Jac. Annal. lib. XVI. vol. III. p. 311.

"It should not be forgotten that systematic republicanism originated with the Independents, and that their political extravagancies were the growth of their religious absurdities; not content with confining to very narrow limits the power of the crown, and reducing the King to the rank of first magistrate, which was the project of the Presbyterians, this sect, more ardent in the pursuit of liberty, aspired to a total abolition of the monarchy, and even of the aristocracy, and projected an entire equality of rank and order, in a republic quite free and independent."—Ibid. Hume, vol. VII. p. 20.

PAGE 77.—*Materials for History.*

In the preceding periods of the English history, we are assisted by the light of public and private records, by the testimonies of writers who were eye-witnesses to what passed on the great theatre of politics, and of statesmen who acted upon it, by the zealous activity of partizans, and the minute diligence of antiquarians, by the splendid declamations of political enthusiasm, and the more elaborate and instructive researches of political scepticism. But of the revolution, which is confessedly a most important epoch, we are content to boast, without the toil of nice and severe examination into the grounds of our triumphs. The effects of that event we indeed feel experimentally; but we seem not to be actuated by any wise and honourable curiosity, to trace out the progressive operations of those causes which then preserved our liberties, and have since continued to establish and enlarge them. The excellent productions of the present age forbid us to impute this silence to the want of ability for the discussion of the most abstruse and complicated subjects, in which history can be employed. But for the want of inclination to discuss them, it is more difficult to account, when we reflect on the fortunate circumstances which concur to facilitate the inquiries of a discerning and impartial historian. The prejudice of parties is considerably abated; the disputes about the right of succession are fortunately terminated; and the controverted questions, which statesmen employ as engines of their ambi-

tion, are very much changed both in form and in principle. The materials for history will appear uncommonly abundant when we consider how much light may be drawn from the works of Swift, Bolingbroke, and their contemporaries, from the memoirs lately published by Macpherson, from the state-papers treasured up in the cabinets of great families, from the controversial writings of the day, and from the parliamentary speeches, many of which are yet faithfully preserved.

Amidst these extraordinary advantages, an historian " might look for the principles of politics in their true source, in the nature and affections of men, and in the secret ties in which they are united together in a state of society."—Vide De Lolme, p. 438. He would never feel the mortifying and disgraceful necessity of having recourse " to such speculative doctrines as are incapable of practical use." Instead of labouring under " the perplexities by which the ablest men are embarrassed in the more abstract questions of politics," he might treat them as a science *sui generis*, and draw forth all those primary and latent causes which are to be found, not in the theories that are woven by our fancies, nor in the prejudices that grow out of our passions, but in the deepest recesses of the understanding and heart of man. It is therefore to be lamented, that the history of Mr. Hume stops short at the very point where assistance was most wanted, and where he was peculiarly able to supply it. The reigns of William and of Anne are most eventful and most interesting; who then does not wish that the pene-

trating genius of Hume had been exercised in unravelling the dark intrigues of statesmen, in balancing all their jarring interests, in describing the rise and progress of contending factions, in marking the slightest shades of their resemblance and dissimilarity, in developing the motives of their sudden unions and sudden separations, and in distinguishing their real from their apparent views? What Hume has not undertaken might, however, be satisfactorily performed by two writers of very opposite tempers, and of powers nearly equal—by the soft and elegant pencil of Robertson, and by the bolder outlines and warmer colouring of Stuart. Robertson probably is a disguised Tory, and Stuart is a constitutional Whig. The one is an advocate for prerogative, but without retaining the silly and exploded doctrines of arbitrary and irresistible power: the other is an admirer of liberty, but with a fixed and manly aversion to all the outrages of boisterous and wanton licentiousness. If such men put forth the whole force of their minds upon the same subject, the reader would find that their prejudices, like opposite forces in mathematics, would destroy each other, and that by the collision of their different opinions, the truth would, in most cases, be happily struck out.

Mrs. Macaulay, I am told, has entered upon the arduous task which I wish to see undertaken by Robertson and Stuart. I have not read Mrs. Macaulay's work; but I am informed, by a very competent judge, that it is written with the same sterling good sense and nervous diction, the same

piercing discernment of character and passionate love of liberty, which distinguish her former volumes. In painting the scenes and marking the manners of private life, Smollett has shown great vigour of invention, a rich vein of pleasantry, an extensive acquaintance with the world, and a deep knowledge of the heart; but he did not possess, in an eminent degree, the talents which peculiarly belong to the province of history, and his mind was violently warped by those political prejudices, from which even Hume was not exempted, by the calmness of his temper, the strength of his understanding, and such philosophical habits of thinking as fall not to the share either of Smollett or Macaulay.

PAGE 81.—*Earl of Oxford.*

Even yet the uncertainty is not fully removed (i. e. whether he was disposed to secure the crown to the Pretender); but the good sense, the integrity, and the moderation of this injured Minister, brighten upon our view more and more. The state papers published by Macpherson, while they degrade some popular characters among the Whigs, rescue the reputation of Oxford from many artful and cruel insinuations: the true designs of this excellent man will be fully known, and the method of conducting them, probably, approved by calm and sensible judges, when the papers relative to the eventful times of his administration and disgrace are published.

PAGE 81.—*Peace of Utrecht.*

The merits of this peace are much disputed; the reader will find a very plausible and elaborate defence of it—Bolingbroke's Lett. on Hist., vol. II. The arguments of Bolingbroke are attacked, in language indeed very feeble, but by arguments pertinent and stubborn, in a series of letters written by Lord Walpole.

PAGE 83.—*High-flyers.*

This ludicrous explanation of the word (Rapin's) brings to our memory the ridicule of Aristophanes upon philosophical high-flyers. Ἀεροβατῶ, καὶ περιφρονῶ τὸν ἥλιον. Nubes, 225. A political high-flyer may be defined in the words of the same writer,

—Ὄρνις ἀστάθμητος πετόμενος
Ἀτέκμαρτος. Aristoph. Ὄρνιθες, 169.

PAGE 84.—*Passive Obedience.*

That silly doctrine is now exploded.—The legality of resistance is not only acknowledged in the speculations of politicians, the decisions of lawyers, and the debates of senators, but approved by the common apprehensions and common sensibilities even of the lowest orders of citizens. This truth, while it is too plain to admit any dispute, is, however, of too delicate a nature for loose and frequent discussion. The most acute and sagacious reasoner cannot

impress upon our minds new conviction—the paltry and officious declaimer may apply the conviction already impressed to fatal purposes.

In the present reign I have been disgusted and provoked at some publications, which seemed to strike at the root of our liberty; but I know not that either in the clumsiest or in the most artful of these pestilential and profligate writings, the doctrine of resistance has been openly attacked, or that of passive obedience tacitly recommended. We may have sometimes been told, for wicked purposes, that to a free state, like our own, regal power *can never* be dangerous. But it has not been even hinted to us, that, be the danger *ever so* great, and ever so glaring, we are bound by every moral and every political tie to crouch under its pressure. For these reasons I think it, in general, unsafe and improper either to assert, in a train of direct and formal reasoning, the right of resistance, or to engage in nice and precarious inquiries, when that right may be actually exercised. For what purposes are such inquiries intended? Is it to replace the ancient landmarks? But they are not yet either decayed by time, or removed by violence. Is it to correct the errors of the people? They seem not to have fallen into any upon this subject. Is it to perpetuate and to invigorate their conviction? In the present age there is no danger that it should be effaced, either by the wiles of sophistry, or the impetuosity of dogmatism. Is it to rouse them from their supineness? Inactivity and indifference to the interests of their country, and

the views of their government, are not among the characteristic faults of this generation. My sincere wish is, indeed, that the people should be informed, not only of their rights, but of the foundations on which they stand—of the extent to which they reach—of the *true* purposes for which they are established—and of the safest and most effectual method by which they may be preserved. But the least reflection on human nature is sufficient to convince us, that such information ought to be conveyed with the utmost caution, and that to convey it well surpasses the abilities of shallow men, and comes not within the wishes of the turbulent and designing.

As to the origin of the absurd doctrine to which Rapin alludes, we learn from Hume, vol. VI. page 572, "that the patriarchal scheme was inculcated in the votes of the convocation preserved by Overall," and "that Filmer was not the first inventor of those absurd notions." But these principles, "which in the time of James passed so smoothly that no historians take any notice of them, have nearly ceased to be the subject of controversy or discourse" for a different reason. Men of the meanest understandings would blush to *avow* them, and the most abject spirit would reject them with scorn and indignation.

In his Essay upon Government, Dr. Priestley has reasoned with his usual acuteness, and declaimed with his usual earnestness, upon the subject of non-resistance. But why, I would ask, has he collected and exerted the powers of his vigorous and comprehensive mind, when the doctrine against which

he points them, is heard only in faint indistinct murmurs amidst the indignant scoffs and loud exultations of a free people?

"God be thanked," says Dr. Priestley himself, "the government of this country is now fixed upon so good and firm a basis, and is so generally acquiesced in, that they are only the mere tools of a court party, or the narrow minded bigots among the clergy, who, to serve their own low purposes, do now and then promote the cry that the church or the state is in danger."—Priestley, &c., page 35.

It is my good fortune not to be alarmed at those fools and bigots, whom Dr. Priestley derides as if he despised them, and yet confutes as if he feared them. Inconsiderable is their number, their reputation is obscure, and their sophistry is so obvious to the good sense, and so offensive to the feelings of Englishmen, that I should be very unwilling by injudicious opposition to bestow upon them a momentary importance, and arrest them in the course by which they are silently descending to contempt and oblivion.

I agree with Dr. Priestley in some of the fundamental principles on which he rests the origin and the use of government. He has stated them with logical precision, and enforced them in the most animated style. I am, however, far from assenting to many incidental positions in his first section. Thus, in page 35, I admit that "an oppressive government, though it has been ever so long established, cannot be lawful;" but I do not call every

government "unlawful and oppressive," in which "*sufficient* provision is not made for the happiness of the subjects of it." If sufficient provision means the greatest possible in given circumstances, every human government is defective; and if such defects "lie open to the generous *attacks* of the noble and daring patriot," mankind, instead of enjoying the advantages of an imperfect constitution, must sacrifice their peace and shed their blood in the unprofitable and endless pursuit of one that is perfect. In the paragraph to which I allude, Dr. Priestley has confounded the negative with the positive faults of government—the want of provision for the utmost possible happiness of a people, with deliberate encroachments upon that happiness—imperfections, which may exist in a good government, and be supplied by the aid of wise and *peaceful* counsels, with oppressions which can exist only in a bad government, and must be quelled by the most vigorous resistance.

To this and to some other opinions in the same section I cannot give my assent, nor can I approve of the unprovoked and unbecoming asperity that breaks out in the defence of some other tenets which are most clear to my understanding, and most interesting to my heart.

It is not uncommon for controversialists to display their skill in grappling with imaginary difficulties, and to contend vehemently in support of those truths, which their real opponents embrace with equal sincerity, and defend with equal ability. Less fondness in expatiating upon the subject, less

energy in expressing the arguments that belong to it, less ardour in pushing its consequences to the extreme boundaries of speculation, less acrimony in multiplying the invidious conclusions that may be drawn from the opposite question, are considered as so many symptoms of hostility. Where Dr. Priestley states the conditions upon which alone resistance may be justified, and then subjoins the *caution* with which it should be undertaken, his arguments will be echoed and re-echoed by many persons who are vulgarly represented as tools of the state and bigots of the church. I will quote Dr. Priestley's words, because he would himself disdain the imputation of contracting the limits of resistance in favour of tyranny, and because no impartial judge can accuse him of enlarging them so as to endanger the stability of just and lawful government.—"In the largest states, if the abuses of government should at any time be great and manifest — if the servants of the people, forgetting their *masters*, and their master's interest, should pursue a separate one of their own — if, instead of considering that they are made for the people, they should consider the people as made for them — if the oppressions and violations of right should be great, flagrant, and universally resented — if the tyrannical governors should have no friends but a few sycophants, who had long preyed upon the vitals of their fellow citizens, and who might be expected to desert a government whenever their interests should be detached from it — if, in consequence of these circumstances, it should become manifest, that the

risque which would be run in attempting a revolution would be trifling, and the evils which might be apprehended from it, were far less than those which were actually suffered, and which were daily increasing; in the name of God, I ask, what principles are those, which ought to restrain an injured and insulted people from asserting their natural rights, and from changing or even punishing their governors, that is, their *servants*, who had abused their trust; or, from altering the whole form of their government, if it appeared to be of a structure so liable to abuse?"—Priestley, page 24.

The fiercest, and I add the *most venal* antagonist of Dr. Priestley, will cheerfully give his assent to these general principles, though as to the precise degree in which they are applicable to particular circumstances, he may not always meet with the concurrence of his dearest and *most disinterested* friends. All parties surely will agree with him in the following plain positions, and in the very awful restrictions by which he has endeavoured to prevent the weak from misunderstanding, and the seditious from misapplying them.—"Whatever be the form of any government, whoever be the supreme magistrates, or whatever be their number, that is, to whomsoever the power of the society is delegated, their authority is, in its own nature, reversible." Page 44.—"This, however, can only be the case in *extreme* oppression; when the blessings of society and civil government, great and important as they are, are bought too dear; when it is better not to be governed at all, than to be governed in such a

manner; or, at least, when the hazard of a change of government would be apparently the less evil of the two; and, therefore, these occasions rarely occur in the course of human affairs. It may be asked, what should a people do in case of less general oppression, and only particular grievances; when the deputies of the people make laws which evidently favour themselves, and beat hard upon the body of the people they represent, and such as they would certainly disapprove, could they be assembled for that purpose? I answer, that when this appears to be very clearly the case, as it ought by all means to do, (since, in many cases, if the government have not power to enforce a bad law, it will not have power to enforce a good one,) the first step which a wise and moderate people will take, is to make a remonstrance to the legislature."—Priestley on Political Liberty, page 45.

What writer has more pointedly condemned the phrenzy of groundless and precipitate sedition, or has more energetically described the hideous consequences which flow from it?

"If a man have common sense he will see it to be madness to propose, or to lay any measures for a general insurrection against the government, except in case of very general and great oppression. Even patriots, in such circumstances, will consider, that present evils always appear greater in consequence of their being present; but that the future evils of a revolt, and a temporary anarchy, may be much greater than are apprehended at a distance. They will also consider, that unless their measures

be perfectly well laid, and their success decisive, ending in a change not of *men*, but of *things*; not of governors, but of the rules and administration of government; they will only rivet their chains the faster, and bring upon themselves and their country tenfold ruin."

The sentiments of Dr. Priestley upon every subject are entitled to respectful attention, and I am happy to show, by the foregoing quotations, that upon this cardinal point of politics he maintains opinions in which the wisest and most temperate friends to the constitution will acquiesce. He with great candour makes allowances for those weak friends of society, who, when there were "recent examples of good Kings deposed, and some of them massacred by wild enthusiasts, laid hold of the doctrine of passive obedience, because it supplied an argument for more effectually preserving the public peace." Let him extend his candour to "this day, when the danger from which that doctrine served to shelter us is over, and the heat of controversy is abated."—"The preposterous and slavish opinion," either lurks in remote obscurity, or is spread over the writings of a few wretched sciolists, whom no philosopher will deign to confute, and no patriot has reason to dread. The scattered and lingering remains of this doctrine would be totally forgotten, were they not kept in our view by the angry and boisterous attacks of the advocates for liberty. "Indeed writers in defence of such absurd and pernicious tenets do not deserve a serious answer; and to allege them in

favour of a corrupt government, which nothing can excuse but their being brought in favour of a good one, is unpardonable."—Pr. on Gov. p. 29.—Τὸ μὴ σιωπᾶν αἰσχρόν.

Unwilling as I am to dwell on the present subject, I have made very copious quotations from Priestley, in order to show that sensible men really differ from each other less than theyseem to do; and that the sturdiest advocate for freedom presumes not to justify resistance, unless in cases where the most strenuous friends of monarchy would allow it to be justifiable. I must, however, acknowledge, that upon the fondness of writers to start suppositions of danger, and to exert the whole force of their eloquence upon the right of men to avert it, I do not look with a very friendly eye.—" Extreme cases (says Mr. Hey) always bring with them all the remedy they are capable of —it is to no purpose to lay down rules about them before-hand; for, when they happen, all rules and laws cease—violence alone has place— in vain would man in any particular circumstances, say at the time, *this is an extreme case*, and attempt to justify himself by argument, in acting as if it really was so. It is trifling to argue about such cases, not merely because those who are involved in them will always act from feelings, which preclude the effect of all arguments, but because the cases cannot be reduced to any distinct general ideas so as to become a proper subject for argumentation. Therefore, in all speculations, we

may consider the legislature as unbounded in its powers."—Hey's Observations on Civil Liberty.

To the justness and importance, to the political wisdom and constitutional spirit of the foregoing observations, I give my hearty assent. They will receive new clearness and new strength from this admirable passage in Mr. Hume—"The question, indeed, with regard to resistance, was a point, which entered into the controversies of the old parties, Cavalier and Roundhead; as it made an essential part of the present disputes between court and country. Few neuters were found in the nation; but among such as would maintain a calm indifference, there prevailed sentiments wide of those which were adopted by either party. Such persons thought that all public declarations of the legislature, either for or against resistance, were equally impolitic, and could serve to no other purpose than to signalize in their turn the triumph of one faction over another—that the simplicity retained in the antient laws of England, as well as in the laws of every other country, ought still to be preserved, and was best calculated to prevent the extremes on either side — that the absolute exclusion of resistance, in all possible cases, was founded on *false* principles; its express admission might be attended with *dangerous* consequences; and there was no necessity for exposing the public to either inconvenience—that if a choice must necessarily be made in the case, the preference of utility to truth in public institutions was apparent; nor could the supposition of resistance,

before-hand and in general terms, be safely admitted in any government—that even in mixed monarchies, where that supposition seemed most requisite, it was yet entirely superfluous; since no man, on the approach of extraordinary necessity, could be at a loss, though not directed by legal declarations, to find the proper remedy—that even those who might, at a distance and by scholastic reasoning, exclude all resistance, would yet hearken to the voice of nature, when evident ruin, both to themselves and the public, must attend a strict adherence to their pretended principles—that the question, as it ought to be entirely excluded from all determinations of the legislature, was even among private reasoners, somewhat frivolous, and little better than a dispute of words—that the one party could not pretend, that resistance ought ever to become a familiar practice; the other would surely have recourse to it in great extremities; and thus the difference could only turn upon the degrees of danger and oppression, which would warrant this irregular remedy—a difference, which, in a general question, it was impossible by any language, precisely to fix or determine."—Hume's Hist. of Eng. vol. VIII. p. 12.

PAGE 90.—*Moderate Tories.*

Perhaps the sentiments of these men nearly correspond with the following language of De Lolme. —"All these considerations (explained in chap. XIX.) strongly point out the very great caution

which is necessary to be used in the difficult business of laying new restraints on the governing authority. Let, therefore, the less informed part of the people, whose zeal requires to be kept up by visible objects, look, if they choose, upon the Crown as the only seat of the evils they are exposed to (mistaken notions on their part are less dangerous than political indifference, and they are more easily directed than roused); but at the same time, let the more enlightened part of the nation constantly remember, that the constitution only subsists by virtue of a proper equilibrium—by a line being drawn between power and liberty. Made wise by the examples of several other nations, by those which the history of this very country affords, let the people in the heat of their struggles in the defence of their liberty, always take heed to reach, never to overshoot the mark—only to repress, never to transfer and diffuse power." —De Lolme on the Constit. of Eng. p. 449.

Page 91.—*Party.*

In the present age we have certainly shaken off many contemptible prejudices, which shackled the understandings of our forefathers. Yet, how few of us have abandoned the iniquitious practice of imputing to a party the crimes of a leader, and to a leader the excentricities of a party? Such a reformation, I fear, is scarcely to be expected while the pride and malignity of the heart feel a secret gratification in reducing the general virtues

of others to particular, and in amplifying their particular faults into general. In the circle of my own acquaintance, I have seen men whose minds, however enlightened by knowledge, and expanded by benevolence, become, on political subjects, weak almost to fatuity, and illiberal even to rancour. Against the principles of Whiggism, shielded as they are by their popularity, it is unsafe to make an open attack; but I have met with some few partizans who seriously adopt the well known definition of Whig, which its author would now be ashamed seriously to defend, and who consider every man that bears the name, as a latitudinarian in religion, and a leveller in the state. The word Tory, on the other hand, is associated with every hideous idea of despotism and bigotry; his real and his imaginary failings are exposed without reserve, and reprobated without mercy; and the favourable reception which is indiscriminately given to the ravings of indiscriminate railers, while it weakens the probability of the accusation among considerate judges, increases the zeal of the inconsiderate accusers.

Some time ago I read an Essay on the Origin of Government, in which the author united much profound and original speculation with a perspicuous and nervous style. His zeal carried with it the marks of a mind that glowed with a generous love of freedom, and his theory, though refined beyond the reach of practice, was evidently the growth of a vigorous and well cultivated understanding. When the sequel of that essay was

published, I eagerly seized it in expectation of new pleasure and new instruction; but instead of deep researches into things, and acute observations upon men, I found only a crude and coarse mass of accusations, complaints, and projects, without regularity and without use. What reader, who has a common share of good sense or good nature, would not turn aside from a writer, who in the very threshhold exhibits such a specimen, as this which follows, of his talents for exaggeration?

"If the question is asked, what are Tory principles? it might be answered, that they are the reverse of the Whig principles of government, and sentiments of the constitution; and so opposite, that neither can a Whig, while he acts on his own principles, do any thing wrong, nor a Tory do any thing right.

"The Tory is content that his happiness should depend upon the good conduct of the king, under whom he is content to be tenant at will for his liberty. The Whig would, as far as is consistent with order, prevent the Crown from having the power to do harm, and considers liberty as his eternal right and freehold, held of the Almighty only. The good of the people is uppermost in the Whig's thoughts; the grandeur of the Prince in the Tory's.

"The Whig, who is a member of the church of England, regards the dissenter as his younger brother, but dislikes the religious, and detests the political principles of the church of Rome, for which the Tory entertains a respectful tenderness, but abomi-

nates the dissenter like Sir Andrew Ague-cheek; and if, like the foolish Knight of Illyria, he was not afraid, he would beat the Puritan like a dog; and if asked like him for his exquisite reason, must answer likewise, that he had no exquisite reason, but reason good enough.

"The Whig thinks the form of government in church and state, is a thing of absolute indifference in itself, excepting as it regards and promotes order, virtue, liberty, and religion, which constitute the true interest and duty of mankind. The Tory is sure that Kings are God's vicegerents, and can almost prove that Archbishops are jure divino. A Whig will kindly tire you sometimes with praises of the constitution, a word never uttered by a Tory mouth, from which you will sooner hear a thousand harangues upon the prerogative, intermixed with astonishment that we can find any body so good naturedly indiscreet as to be minister, or to reign over us; and their last principle is to renounce all the above, when they become troublesome to the possessor or professor."—See Sequel to an Essay on the Origin and Progress of Government, p. 4.

* * * * * * * * *

"Such being the principles and marks of a Tory, to be collected as much from the actions as the words of the virtuous and well-meaning among them, of which there are abundance; (and if these are not their principles, their actions can arise only from absolute ignorance and inattention, or profligate corruption; for to no other principles can they be reconciled;) it is no wonder, that by acting consist-

ently with them, they have assisted the wicked endeavours of unprincipled men, to overthrow the constitution, both when in authority, and when out of administration. Let us take a look at them when in disgrace and when triumphant; the latter glimpse is indeed unpleasant, as their prosperity is England's adversity."—Ibid. p. 6.

To what cause can such language be ascribed, but to the fascinating power of prejudice, and the loathsome malignity of party? When assertion is thus substituted for proof, and censure degenerates into scurrility, there is no room for argumentative confutation; and who would descend to the wretched task of retorting what cannot be read without disgust and abhorrence? Let me address this able theorist, (for such he really and eminently is) in the words of a person whose works, I doubt not, are familiar to him.—" Maledictum est, illud tuum, si vere objicitur, vehementis accusatoris, sin falso, maledici convitiatoris: quare, cum isto sis ingenio, non debes, M. Cato, arripere maledictum e trivio, aut ex scurrarum aliquo convicio."—Orat. pro Muræn.

The above mentioned sequel is dedicated to a Senator, whose intemperate severity in loading his antagonist with reproaches is often lamented by those, who look up with admiration to his attainments and his virtues. For the imperfection of the patron we may find some apology in the same speech which just now supplied me with an expostulation to his dedicator—" Quod atrociter in senatu dixisti, aut non dixisses, aut seposuisses, aut mitiorem in partem interpretarere. Ac te ipsum, quantum,

ego opinione auguror, nunc et animi quodam impetu concitatum, et vi naturæ atque ingenii elatum, et recentibus præceptorum studiis flagrantem, jam usus flectet, dies leniet, ætas mitigabit."—Orat. pro Muræn.

Mr. Hume, whose insight into the views of partizans will not be controverted by the writer whose opinions I am now censuring, gives us a very different account.

"The mere name of King commands little respect; and to talk of a King as God's vicegerent on earth, or to give him any of those magnificent titles, which formerly dazzled mankind, would be to excite laughter in every one."—Essays, vol. I. p. 47.

PAGE 93.—*Perfection of Government.*

The perfection of all government is relative; for, according to the well known distinction of Solon, the best laws are, not those which are captivating in theory, but those which are useful in practice—not such as a philosopher is capable of framing ideally, but such as a people are actually capable of receiving. That perfection is different in different circumstances. Through the fluctuating opinions, the boisterous passions, and jarring interests of men, it is, in every country, of slow and irregular growth. In our own, it proceeds from many unsuspected and even opposite causes—from unforeseen and inexplicable accidents, as well as from the most profound and active policy—from the disappointment of human projects, as well as from their success—from

unjust opposition to power, as well as from the unjust usurpation of it—from Papists and Protestants—from sectaries and churchmen—from Parliaments and Kings—who in their turns have all been enemies to liberty, and have all contributed directly or indirectly, intentionally or eventually, to its preservation, its enlargement, and its stability. We may, exhypothesi, allow with Hume, that the constitution of England acquired its greatest firmness and precision at the accession of William III.—that before this period the government of it was unsteady in its operations, and, in some solitary instances, seemed to be doubtful in its principles—that our rights were sometimes indistinctly understood, and sometimes feebly asserted—that the importance of the Commons was less early and less considerable than every generous friend to our liberties must wish, and some of its enthusiastic panegyrists have supposed—that the Nobles were obsequious to the King, and oppressive to the people—that the King undermined the just privileges of his Parliament, and trampled on the just claims of his subjects. But from particular and detached events, from sudden and transient irregularities, and from the imperfect state of society which occasioned them, no inference can be drawn against the general right of mankind to be free, or the general disposition of our countrymen to vindicate their freedom. On this momentous topic I am happy to shelter my own sentiments under the authority of those distinguished writers to whose works I have frequently had re-

course, for the illustration or the support of the Dissertation here republished.

"By the free constitution of the English monarchy, every advocate of liberty, that understands himself, I suppose means, that limited plan of policy, by which the supreme legislative power (including in this general term the power of levying money) is lodged, not in the Prince singly, but jointly in the Prince and people; whether the popular part of the constitution be denominated the King's or Kingdom's great council, as it was in the proper feudal times; or the Parliament, as it came to be called afterwards; or, lastly, the two Houses of Parliament, as the style has now been for several ages.

"To tell us, that this constitution has been different at different times, because the regal or popular influence has, at different times been more or less predominant, is only playing with a word, and confounding constitution with administration. According to this way of speaking, we have not only had three or four, but possibly three or four score, different constitutions. So long as that great distribution of the supreme authority took place (and it has constantly and invariably taken place, whatever other changes there might be, from the Norman establishment down to our times) the nation was always enabled, at least authorised, to regulate all subordinate, or, if you will, supereminent claims and pretensions. This it effectually did at the revolution; and by so doing, has not created a new plan of policy, but perfected the old one. The great

master wheel of the English constitution is still the same; only freed from those checks and restraints, by which, under the specious name of prerogatives, time and opportunity has taught our Kings to obstruct and embarrass its free and regular movements."—Hurd's Dialogues.

"From the Saxon conquest, during a long succession of ages, this fortunate Island has never degenerated from liberty. In the most inclement periods of its history, it despaired not of independence. It has constantly fostered that indignant spirit which disdains all subjection to an arbitrary sway. The constitution, prospering under the shocks it received, fixed itself at the highest point of liberty that is compatible with government. May it continue its purity and vigour! and give felicity and greatness to the most distant times!"—Vid. Stuart's Discourse on the Laws and Govern. of England, p. 32.

"A spirit of liberty, transmitted down from our Saxon ancestors, and the unknown ages of our government, preserved itself through one almost continual struggle against the usurpation of our Princes, and the vices of the people; and they whom neither the Plantagenets nor the Tudors could enslave were incapable of suffering their rights and privileges to be ravished from them by the Stuarts. They bore with the last King of this unhappy race till it was shameful, as it must have been fatal, to bear any longer; and whilst they asserted their liberties, they refuted and anticipated, by their temper and their patience, all the objections which foreign and domestic abetters of tyranny are apt to make against

the conduct of our nation towards their Kings. Let us justify the conduct by persisting in it, and continue to ourselves the peculiar honour of maintaining the freedom of our Gothic institution of government, when so many other nations, who enjoyed the same, have lost theirs."—Lord Bolingbroke's Dissertat. upon Parties, vol. III. p. 145.

From so complete and well concerted a scheme of servility it has been the work of generations for our ancestors to redeem themselves and their posterity into that state of liberty which we now enjoy; and which, therefore, is not to be looked upon as consisting of mere encroachments on the Crown, and infringements on the prerogative, as some slavish and narrow-minded writers in the last century endeavoured to maintain; but, as in general, a gradual restoration of that ancient constitution, whereof our Saxon forefathers had been unjustly deprived, partly by the policy, and partly by the force of the Normans."—Blackstone, vol. IV. book IV. chap. 33, p. 420.

"The political liberty of the people was cherished by the benign influence of the Saxon constitution; it was blasted by the malignant aspect of Norman tyranny. By an happy coincidence of events, the unalienable rights of man resulted from a system of oppression. We are indebted to the arbitrary convention of the feudal vassals for the blessings of a popular legislation." Ibbetson's Dissertation on the National Assemblies under the Saxon and Norman Government, p. 52.—I quote this passage from a very ingenious and elegant work which fell into my

hands after the first part of Rapin was sent to the press. The origin, progress, and revolutions of Parliament, the increase, the decline and final restoration of its powers, the extensive rights of soccage and the primary causes of representation, are explained by this writer with great clearness of arrangement and great energy of style. The reader will excuse me for quoting a few passages which tend to confirm my opinion concerning the antiquity of Parliaments. I should have been happy to have introduced them sooner in another place; but they are not altogether unconnected with the subject of this note. "We may venture to conclude, that the people elected their protectors, who assumed a just pre-eminence in the great assembly of the nation; and that their political rights were by no means compressed by the regal prerogative, or overwhelmed by the weight of aristocratical importance. The opinions of the philosophers of Greece were propagated by the swords of the Northern conquerors; impatient of oppression, they felt the necessity of freedom; undirected by systematical arrangements the exertions of virtue were instinctive. The congenial spirit of liberty delighted in the German forests, and consecrated the rocks of Scandinavia; it expanded in the uncultivated waste, where nothing was constrained, where nature herself was independent." Ibid. p. 10. — And again, in p. 15: "It must be candidly allowed, that the national assembly of our Saxon ancestors asserted the right of electing its supreme magistrate—that it possessed the legislative, the judicial, and the fiscal powers—and that

the people had a considerable share in the direction of its councils and the confirmation of its decrees." In page 29 he traces out the causes of popular representation, and evidently confirms my opinion, that the Commons, before the time of Henry the Third, formed a part of the Parliament, and that to remedy the inconveniences of their attendance upon such service, or their neglect of it, the legislature adopted the expedient of representation. I am happy in adding the name of Mr. Ibbetson to the list of those who, uniting the professional knowledge of lawyers with the more precarious researches of antiquarians, have opposed the opinion of Mr. Hume, who contends for the late existence of Parliaments. But Mr. Hume himself, though he calls off our admiration from the antiquity of the constitution, hath, in this glowing and charming language encouraged us to set a high value upon that form of government under which we now live. "On the whole, the English have no reason, from the example of their ancestors, to be in love with the picture of absolute monarchy; or to prefer the unlimited authority of the Prince and his unbounded prerogatives, to that noble liberty, that sweet equality, and that happy security, by which they are at present distinguished above all nations in the universe."—Hume, vol. v. p. 471.

The Whigs are not ashamed of cherishing such a constitution with ardent fondness, of guarding it with unremitted vigilance, or of defending it with unshaken intrepidity; when it is really in danger, the moderate Tories will show themselves not almost,

but altogether, attached to the same cause, and animated with the same zeal.

PAGE 107.—*Creation of the Twelve Peers.*

The hardiest apologist for prerogative would shrink from the idea of defending this outrageous and profligate measure. An artifice so insulting to the dignity, so offensive to the feelings, and so alarming to the apprehensions of free citizens will probably be never attempted again, or at least the attempt will be accompanied with less success, and followed up by the spirited and terrible indignation of an injured people. The power of the Crown to create Peers, is, like every other power, open to abuse. Yet, perhaps, if we look back through a long succession of our Princes, we shall find that no one of their privileges has been stretched more rarely beyond its due bounds, or attended with less pernicious effects.

While the House of Commons continues, what it ought to be, an assembly of men respectable for their opulence, their personal weight, and their wisdom, they will not become the instruments of their own degradation; for such they would be, if they prevented the Crown from conferring those honours, to which they may themselves aspire from the most laudable motives, and which they often earn by the most important services. The pride of the Nobles who are jealous of the novi homines, may, indeed, upon this subject, be united with the pride of the people, who look with no less jealousy

upon the recent advancement of their equals, and the antient privileges of their superiors. But in conspiring to wrench from the Crown this old and venerable part of the prerogative, both the Nobles and the people would act against their own true interests. The House of Lords would no longer be supplied by men who have distinguished themselves by eloquence in the senate, by sagacity in the cabinet, or by valour in the field. Those objects which now actuate the honest ambition of our representatives would be removed, and the office of representation, instead of being eagerly courted as an honour, would be reluctantly submitted to as a task. While men are men, the consciousness of upright intention, and even the voice of an applauding people, may not always be sufficient allurements to great and splendid exertions in the cause of our country. Rewards of a more permanent nature will produce more important effects; and, surely, when public distinctions acquired by public services are the foundations of a family, it is difficult to substitute a more proper or a more efficacious encouragement; for, by such an expedient, the wishes of an individual are gratified, while the revenues of the state are not exhausted. We should not forget the deep and destructive policy of Sylla, when he barred against the Tribunes those avenues into the Senate which had been open to their predecessors. By this measure he seems to have restored the dignity, or rather to have established the tyranny of the Senate. At the same time he made the tribuneship an object of attention

to the meanest and most worthless citizens. He debased its importance, sapped its authority, and gained an easy conquest over the rights which that office was intended to protect.

Our own history presents us with an instance of the unworthy motives which dictated, and of the wise measures which frustrated, a most indecent attempt to lop off, or, at least, to cramp this branch of the prerogative.—"A bill was presented, and carried, in the House of Lords, for limiting the Peers to a fixed number, beyond which it should not be increased; but after great pains taken to ensure the success of this bill, it was at last rejected by the House of Commons."—De Lolme, page 398.

PAGE 109.—*Prerogative.*

It is not easy to convince men of the utility, or reconcile them to the continuance of a power which they do not themselves exercise immediately or remotely. Their inability, or unwillingness, to be thus persuaded, arises from the more exquisite sensibility of the mind under the pressure of occasional evil, than in the possession of general good; from the lurking ambition of drawing all authority within the circle of our own party; and from the overwhelming dread which seizes our imaginations on the contemplation of regal power, to which the resistance of an individual is so very inadequate.—"Our manner," says Hooker, "is always to cast a more suspicious eye towards that "over which we know we have least power."—Page 37.

From these causes, which it is unnecessary further to explain, and from others, which it might be invidious to particularize, have arisen the excessive prejudices which many persons in our own age entertain upon the subject of prerogative; and by a weakness, which the noblest understandings cannot always subdue, the same persons are prone to cherish unkind and unworthy suspicions of every man who firmly adheres to opinions, the reasons of which are unperceived by themselves. Far am I from wishing to lull asleep the watchfulness of free citizens over their liberties, or to pilfer away the smallest particle of the power which they have to defend them. But considering the rights of the people, the privileges of the Parliament, and the prerogative of the King, as equally and severally the instruments of the public good, I should be sorry to see the due efficacy of the means diminished through a misguided zeal for the end. I shall, for this reason, produce the full and positive evidence of Mr. Locke, where he points out the usefulness, and contends for the necessity of the prerogative.

"Where the legislative and executive power are in distinct hands (as they are, in all moderated monarchies and well-framed governments), there the good of the society requires that several things should be left to the discretion of him that has the executive power. For, the legislators not being able to foresee and provide by laws for all that may be useful to the community, the executor of the laws, having the power in his hands, has, by the common law of nature, a right to make use of it

for the public good of the society, in many cases where the municipal laws has given no direction, till the legislative can conveniently be assembled to provide for it. Many things there are which the law can by no means provide for, and these must necessarily be left to the discretion of him that has the executive power in his hands, to be ordered by him, as the public good and advantage shall require; nay it is fit that the laws themselves should in some cases give way to the executive power, or rather to this fundamental law of nature and governments, viz. that as much as may be all the members of the society are to be preserved.

"This power to act according to discretion, for the public good, without the prescription of the law, and sometimes even against it, is that which is called prerogative. For since, in some governments, the law-making power is not always in being, and is usually too numerous, and so too slow for the dispatch requisite to execution; and because it is also impossible to foresee, and so by laws to provide for all accidents and necessities that may concern the public, or to make such laws as will do no harm, if they are executed with an inflexible rigour, on all occasions, and upon all persons that may come in their way; therefore there is a latitude left to the executive power, to do many things of a choice which laws do not provide.

"This power, whilst employed for the benefit of the community, and suitably to the trust and ends of the government, is undoubted prerogative, and never is questioned; for the people are very seldom,

or never, scrupulous or nice in the point; they are far from examining prerogative, whilst it is, in any tolerable degree, employed for the use it was meant; that is, for the good of the people, and not manifestly against it. But if there comes to be a question between the executive power and the people, about a thing claimed as a prerogative, the tendency of the exercise of such prerogative to the good or hurt of the people, will easily decide that question."—Vid. Locke, on Civil Government, vol. II. page 220.

In determining the beneficial or injurious tendency of prerogative in particular instances—in balancing the advantages and the disadvantages of controling it—in adjusting the precise degree to which its general operations should be extended or confined, Whigs may differ from Tories, and even from each other. But as to its origin and its object, none but the most obstinate will disagree with Mr. Locke. In the present age, when prerogative is circumscribed within such just boundaries by law, and is reduced by other causes to yet greater debility than the law supposes, the sentiments of moderate men on both sides are useful to the community. If the one party are disposed to encroach upon the rights of the Crown, the common interest of the state may require that the other should with equal firmness resist encroachment. By a spirit of mutual concession and mutual good-will they may either prevent the necessity of entering into these invidious discussions, or may enter upon them with an honest desire of discovering what is really ex-

pedient, and of doing what is really just. They may come equally prepared to support prerogative in its present form, or to avail themselves of every proper occasion, as well for relaxing it without insult to the Crown, as for enlarging it without danger to the community.

PAGE 111.—*Tories.*

When I was mentioning my design of re-publishing Rapin to a learned neighbour, who, to the logical acuteness of Hume has united the sentimental delicacy of Rousseau, he told me, that Tories always masked their design under the veil of whiggism. His observation reminded me of a passage in Hume, who seems to entertain very similar sentiments. "The Tories (says he) have been so long obliged to talk in the republican style, that they seem to have made converts of themselves by their hypocrisy, and to have embraced the sentiments as well as the language of their adversaries." Hume, vol. I. Essay VIII. — For this conduct, which patriots will stigmatize as the meanest dissimulation, and the man of the world may palliate as necessary caution, it is not very difficult to account. Mankind, it is well known, are infatuated by the sorcery of mere words; and where offensive qualities, in consequence of accidental and temporary circumstances, have been blended together with the most salutary, the conceptions of the multitude are too gross, and their passion too precipitate for nice discrimination. Amidst a people

jealous of every attempt either to steal away their liberties by silent encroachment, or to wrest them by ruffian force, all kinds and all degrees of attachment to prerogative appear in a questionable shape. Easy it is indeed for the evil or turbulent leaders of a party to load with invidious names the best founded opinions and the best directed measures; but it is *not* easy to lead on vulgar minds by a long and intricate chain of argument to any fixed conviction, that the power of one is not only compatible with the actual freedom of many, but even necessary to its regularity and its permanence — that the authority now scattered through numbers in the other component parts of our legislature, may be suddenly collected into a mass sufficient to crush the very rights they were intended to shelter — or that prerogative bounded by law is an equal barrier against the insidious ambition of the nobles, and the desperate rashness of the multitude. The conviction produced by such reasoning is feeble, loose, and transient. Upon the first and slightest impression, it is accompanied by secret repinings at the hard necessity of human affairs, which has rendered submission to one man the price of our security—it gives way at the first alarm even of imaginary danger—it is instantaneously and utterly effaced by those flattering descriptions of popular governments, which the ancient orators have exhibited in all the dazzling colours of eloquence, and which the history of almost every ancient state tends to confute by the stubborn testimony of fact.

There is yet another reason which may induce

the Tories to disclaim that appellation. Their ancestors were, some of them secretly, and some openly, attached to the family of the Stuarts.

"Jacobitism," indeed, as Stuart observes, "is retiring to seek obscurity and repose in its grave." Page 39, on the Public Law and Constitution of Scotland. — It is now deprived even of the coarse and blunt instruments which politicians employ upon the credulity of the weak and the hopes of the sanguine. It presents not the faintest ray of hope to the few who yet linger in its defence, and it has ceased to supply even its enemies with stale pretences for accusation. But Jacobitism, thus forlorn and hopeless, is yet supposed to have left some of its original taint upon the descendants of those, who drank in the infection from its primary source and in its unabated malignity. "The Crown," it is said, "will naturally bestow all its trust and power upon those whose principles, real or pretended, are most favourable to monarchical government." Hume's Essays, vol. I. page 62.—The Tories, it is added, still retain their fondness for the pageantry of regal power, and for its gaudy appendage, the hierarchy. It is almost impossible that the attachment of a court party to monarchy should not degenerate into an attachment to the Monarch—when the hopes of the Stuart family are quite extinguished, the personal adherents *might* be consistently, as it *would* be zealously, transferred to any other Prince whose principles were friendly to what they called the ancient constitution.

These censures, if meant to be general are un-

just, and where they are just, the objects of them have ceased to be formidable, from the very inconsiderable number to which the high-flyers are now reduced. "A Tory loved monarchy (says Hume), and bore an affection to the family of the Stuarts; but the latter affection was the predominant inclination; when that inclination can no longer be gratified, we ought to consider them as mere lovers of monarchy, though without abandoning liberty."

There is a general opinion, that whatever be the real abilities or seeming virtues of any administration, the public safety requires some party to stand in opposition to them. The ground of this opinion is the tendency which even the best and wisest men have to push their favourite sentiments to extremes, unless they be diligently watched and occasionally controlled. Upon the same principle every friend to the constitution of this country would wish for the existence of two parties, whether they be known by the names of Whig and Tory, or the country and the court party. In each there are ingredients, which, properly tempered, are salutary to the state; and in each, also, there are some principles—which tend to the subversion of our present government, and to the introduction either of monarchy or republicanism. From the due adjustment and united efficacy of these opposite principles from their occasional resistance and occasional co-operation in different circumstances, a politician perceives in the moral world, as the philosopher discovers in the natural,

Quid velit et possit rerum concordia discors.

I must, however, acknowledge, that in shunning a name, which, in the estimation of impartial men is by no means dishonourable to them, the Tories seem to act an ungenerous, and, upon the whole, an imprudent part. By avowing their sentiments, by separating what they retain from what they have abandoned, by declaring, what many of them are known to believe, that the dignity of the Crown and the freedom of the subject are inseparable, they would show us all that is to be feared, and all that is to be hoped from them. By disclaiming those sentiments, or affecting to muffle them up in secrecy, they betray a consciousness of intentions, which they dare not avow—they plunge themselves into greater odium than that which they wish to avoid—they encourage their adversaries to fasten upon them every charge, which the malevolence of party can ascribe, or its credulity believe—to make them suspected of the evils which they do not, and hated even for the good which they do—to swell their guilt into any magnitude, and distort it to any degree of deformity, which may serve the purposes of unprincipled and shameless rivals.

If the remark of my friend be well founded, I think the republication of this pamphlet expedient, even for the very reasons which at first light render it unnecessary. To know the real character of the partisans is always of use, and surely the representation which Rapin has given of the Tories is not very disgraceful to them, nor very alarming to the public. In the general course of affairs they check the principles of whiggism from those extrava-

gancies into which political tenets, sometimes by the cunning, and sometimes even by the sincerity of those who hold them, precipitate the leaders of parties. Their opinions in material points do not stray very widely from those of the Whigs, and in some critical situations, where the liberty of our country was at stake, their conduct was precisely the same.

In these enlightened times the cause of the Stuart family is quite sunk into oblivion, the doctrine of divine right is treated with derision, and the pleas for arbitrary power are repelled with abhorrence. We have little therefore to fear from a momentary association of the Tories with the high-flyers. But we have much to hope from a firm and lasting combination between the moderate men of both descriptions. In such a combination only can we find a secure and impregnable bulwark against the fatal and more imminent dangers by which we are now surrounded from the licentious manners of the age, from the relaxed state of the police, and from the aspiring views of those, who, if they mean not to drag in a democratical government, are yet striving to shake the pillars of regal power.

It is remarkable, that in different circumstances the same language is spoken, and nearly the same conduct pursued by different parties. "The Tories," says Hume, "have frequently acted as republicans where either policy or revenge has engaged them to that conduct. The Whigs have also taken steps dangerous to liberty under colour of securing the settlement and succession to the Crown according to their views."

During the reign of George I. and his immediate successor, the Tories levelled their complaints against the corruption of the Parliament and the influence of the Crown. By the Whigs, who at first ventured to introduce that influence, and who afterwards extended it, the very same complaint has been urged with equal vehemence and equal plausibility in the present reign. What conclusion then will an unprejudiced observer draw from these ludicrous inconsistencies? He will suppose either that the evil is exaggerated, or that neither party are disposed to remedy it. If their accusations be ill-founded, both are factious, and ought to be opposed; if they be well-founded, both are, in some measure, insincere, and cannot be implicitly or exclusively trusted. For, when the avenues to power were open to them, neither party have shown any reluctance to execute what in others they had pointedly condemned, to receive, what they call, the wages of corruption, and to widen the sphere of influence.

For my part, I am persuaded that they do not seriously believe, what they peremptorily assert. By family or personal connections—by prejudices, where principle has too little share, and resentment has too much — by the eagerness of men to partake those emoluments which are insufficient to gratify the wishes of all the candidates, they are thrown into a state of wild opposition. Every precipitate step to which they are incited by their passions makes a retreat, though approved by their better judgment, more difficult and more *dishonourable.*

"Certis quibusdam destinatisque sententiis quasi addicti et consecrati sunt, eaque necessitate constricti, ut etiam quæ non probare soleant, ea cogantur *constantiæ* causâ defendere."—Tusc. II. lib. II.

Mutually provoking and provoked, they are too often tempted to censure what they know to be right, to oppose what they believe to be useful, and to justify in their public declarations, what in their moments of private reflection they cannot but condemn. They are led by the mechanical power of example to support a system where the public happiness is often sacrificed to private cabals—the evil issuing from those cabals is seldom foreseen, and, if foreseen, seldom regarded; and even the good deserves to be sometimes considered rather as the accidental result of their actions than as the immediate aim of the agents themselves.

PAGE 115.—*American war.*

My mind is, I trust, superior to the petty vanity of wantoning in paradox, and especially upon subjects where the character of my superiors and the interest of my country are concerned. Yet I cannot help expressing my hopes, that the evils of which we loudly complain, and under some of which we really labour, admit of a remedy which it is not very difficult to apply. In the late struggles concerning America,

Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.

All parties carried their animosities to unwarrantable lengths, and therefore all should now concur in

alleviating the calamities to which those animosities have given rise. Experience has shown us, that whatever the weakness or the wickedness of some partizans may be, the general malignity of party is far less than it has been represented by the wicked, and believed by the weak. That malignity is gradually corrected by time—it is made harmless by the temperature of happy circumstances—it may be quite purged away by the steady use of vigorous remedies in those who are infected by it. When the power of the King is defined with such legal precision, and the business of government conducted with such systematic regularity, I see nothing in the principles of moderate Whigs and Tories which ought to prevent honest men from concurrence in the administration of Government. By such concurrence what is amiss in either party may be rectified—what is right may be called forth into action for the best purposes.

Do I then suppose it possible for men to divest themselves of their ambition? No, surely; but I wish them to gratify it upon those honourable terms, which may put them above the necessity of cherishing mean prejudices, and of stooping to yet meaner misrepresentations. I wish to see a strong phalanx of avowed Whigs and Tories set in array against a dark and desperate race of men, who have lately risen up among us, whose real views are quite unsearchable, and whose conduct, so far as it can be known, possesses neither the firm texture of system, nor the delicate exterior of honour.

Something of this kind will, I hope, be ultimately effected by a late coalition.

I am aware how wide a field that event has opened for the display of puny wit and noisy rhetoric; it has staggered the obstinate and disgusted the superficial; it has been the subject of much tragical complaint, and much bitter sarcasm among the Vatinii of modern times, who, endeavouring to cajole both parties, were by both rejected. With these men it is fruitless to expostulate, and it were indecent to plead the authority of such examples for direct and personal railing. Rather let me join my wishes to those of many virtuous men, who were neither surprised nor offended by this political miracle, and who, in the indissoluble union of parties, whom passion, rather than principle, has kept asunder, expect a happy termination of those intestine divisions by which the country has been so long and so fatally convulsed. Even the inferior ranks of society will at last recover from the delirium into which they have been thrown, by the calumnies of disappointed men; and the motives of the coalition will, I hope, be more clearly understood, and more generally approved, when the effects of it in restoring the stability, the dignity, and the energy of government, shall be more widely felt.

PAGE 116.—*Fox and North:*

Every artifice is now employed to fix the eyes of the public upon two famous leaders, and to keep

the merits of their cause, and the virtues of their adherents out of sight. I know not whether the conduct of these statesmen admit of complete justification; and amidst the complicated interests and tempestuous scenes of public life, who is there that never swerves from the plain and strait path? but the guilt of it has been industriously exaggerated, and accusations have been brought against it rather ungraciously, I think, and indelicately by some men, who are known to have been capable of acting with any party—who are suspected of being faithful to none—and have therefore forfeited the esteem and confidence of all.

Upon a calm and serious attention to the merits of those leaders, I think the country may derive from them the most interesting services. They possess great knowledge, splendid talents, and that maturity of judgment which experience alone can bestow. Τέχναι δὲ ἑτέρων ἕτεραι. The supposed inactivity of ——— will be supplied by the unwearied vigour of ———. The impetuosity of ——— will be corrected by the discretion of———. For the one we may apologise as Agamemnon did for his brother,

> Παλλάκι γὰρ μεθίει τε, καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλει πονέεσθαι,
> Οὔτ' ὄκνῳ εἴκων, οὔτ' ἀφραδίῃσι νόοιο. Hom. Il. x. l. 121.

To the other we may apply the splendid imagery of Pindar.

> ——————τόλμα γὰρ εἰκὼς
> θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θερῶν λεόντων
> ἐν πόνῳ μῆτιν δ' ἀλώπηξ,
> αἰετοῦ ἅτ' ἀναπιτναμενὰ
> ῥόμβον ἴσχει.—Pindar. Isthm. Ode IV. Antistroph. III.

PAGE 117.—*Duke of Portland.*

As to the integrity of that excellent man who presides over the treasury bench, it is placed above the reach of suspicion itself; and the honest intentions of his new associate are gradually bursting through the cloud of calamities that darkened his administration. In the adherents of both are to be found men of the noblest families, the most distinguished abilities, and the most irreproachable characters.

PAGE 117.—*Mr. Pitt.*

Happy shall I be to find this respectable association strengthened and adorned by the accession of a rising senator, whom his more rational admirers may wish to see connected with other colleagues, employed in a less doubtful cause, and supporting by his counsels that government which it were an inglorious triumph to disturb by his popularity. In the character of this extraordinary man, we see a rare and magnificent assemblage of excellencies, as well natural as acquired, of attainments not less solid than brilliant, extensive learning, refined taste, and discernment, both widely comprehensive and minutely accurate. By a kind of intuition he seems to grasp that knowledge of men and things, to which others are compelled to ascend by slow and patient toil. His genius, in the mean time, acquires fresh lustre, from integrity hitherto uncorrupted, and, I

hope, incorruptible. The fierceness of ambition he tempers, or is capable of tempering, by the softest and most exquisite feelings of humanity.

Ὦ παῖ γένοιο πατρὸς [ἡπιώτερος,]
Τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ὁμοῖος.—Soph. Aj.

To the generous ardour of youth he has added the extensive views of age, and he may, without flattery, be said to possess at once the captivating eloquence of Callidius, and the yet more fascinating policy of Scipio.—"Est enim non veris tantum virtutibus mirabilis, sed arte quadam ab juventâ ad ostentationem earum compositus."—See Livy, book XXIV. vol. II. p. 454, and Tully's Brutus, p. 663, edit. Vergerg.

To those who reflect on the fallaciousness of political professions, the uncertainty of human resolutions, and the intoxicating effects of habitual power, even the unjust clamours that have been raised against the coalition may appear not without their use. Our governors may become more anxious to deserve some portion of that popularity which their rivals are said to have already gained, or, disdaining to share a prize for which the meanest contend, they may lift up their views to the acquisition of solid and lasting glory. The violence of opposition will cement their union, and its vigilance repress their rashness. Even the abilities of those with whom they are struggling will call forth more vigorous exertions, not in the unprofitable and ostentatious conflicts of parliamentary chivalry, but in those salutary counsels which gradually efface the impressions of calumny, and stamp upon the reputation of those

by whom they are planned, the brightest and most indelible marks of wisdom. While their motives are honest, and their measures judicious, they may look with indifference upon reproaches which they have not deserved, and which, from the weariness or the fickleness of those who now repeat them, will quickly drop into oblivion. Relinquendum est tempus conviciis quo senescant.—Tacit.

From the agitations of our hopes and fears—from the perversion of judgment, which is always produced by personal affection and personal antipathy—and, above all, from the secret bias which our private interests throw upon our decisions concerning the merit of public characters, it is scarce possible, I acknowledge, for the best and wisest among us either to examine this subject with sufficient precision, or to speak of it with unaffected moderation. But posterity will be placed in better circumstances, and influenced by a better temper, in forming their judgment. They may see, that the good men of all parties are ashamed of a contest in which they have been the slaves of passion, or the dupes of cunning; they may think that, if contention had been perpetuated among us, ruin must have ensued—that reconciliation could not be accomplished without real inconsistence and seeming insincerity—and that all those concessions which the obstinate call cowardice, and the rash pronounce treachery, are in reality but the sacrifices of pride and resentment to the public good. They will perceive that the inward distractions and external disasters of this kingdom are to be chiefly imputed, not to the

real principles of Whigs or Tories, but to those miscreants, who, having no principle, have practiced on the weakness, abused the confidence, and usurped the authority of both.

"Stare omnes debemus, tanquam in orbe aliquo reipublicæ; qui quoniam versetur, eam deligere partem, ad quam nos illius utilitas, salusque converterit. Neque enim inconstantis puto sententiam, tanquam aliquod navigium, atque cursum, ex reipublicæ tempestate moderari. Ego vero hæc didici, hæc vidi, hæc scripta legi; hæc de sapientissimis & clarissimus viris, et in hac republicâ, & in aliis civitatibus, monumenta nobis literæ prodiderunt; non semper easdem sententias ab iisdem, sed, quascumque reipublicæ status, inclinatio temporum, ratio concordiæ postularet, esse defendendas."—Orat. pro Cn. Planc. page 425, edit. Grut.

PAGE 118.—*Church Tories.*

"As to ecclesiastical parties, we may observe, that in all ages of the world priests have been enemies to liberty, and it is certain, that this steady conduct of them must have been founded on fixed reasons of interest and ambition. Liberty of thinking, and expressing our thonghts, is always fatal to priestly power, and to those pious frauds on which it is commonly founded; and by an infallible connexion which prevails among every species of liberty, this privilege can never be enjoyed, at least has never yet been enjoyed, but in a free government. Hence, it will happen, in such a government as that of

Britain, that the established clergy, while things are in their natural situation, will always be of the court party." Hume's Essays, page 63.—If the establishment did not support the state by which it is created and protected, it would act a very unjust and very absurd part. But why should the clergy be ashamed of adhering to the court, "while things are in their natural situation," while the laws are faithfully executed, and the government is wisely administered? In a contrary situation of affairs, they have shown themselves strenuous advocates for our civil rights, and in the present age they have avowed the doctrines, and extended the influence of religious liberty. Priestly power is now diminished in its bulk, and disarmed of its terrors; what remains of it is not founded on pious fraud, and has nothing to fear from the most unbounded liberty of thinking. Had Mr. Rapin been eye-witness to the controversies which have been agitated in this century, he would not have included all the members of the Church of England under the name of Tories. Hume, probably, bestowed upon those controversies a transient glance, and was not very correct in calculating their beneficial effects, which, if they could not subdue his prejudices, must have confuted his accusations.

PAGE 119.—*Church of England.*

It will be difficult to name a time, compared with the present, when the Church of England was adorned by prelates who were possessed of learning

at once so elegant and so profound, who united such liberality of spirit with such purity of morals, and were distinguished by so much faith without timid credulity, and so much piety without trifling superstition.

Among men whose profession calls upon them to think justly, and whose education enables them to think for themselves, some difference of opinion must naturally be expected on the more controverted subjects of politics and religion. That difference, however, would, in all probability, be neither *greater*, nor *less*, if there were no articles to be subscribed, and even no establishment to be supported. But the disputes of this enlightened age are surely exempt from the odium theologicum which disgraced the writings of our forefathers—they are conducted without bitterness of temper, and without brutality of language—they are seldom employed on those abstruse topics which inflame, indeed, the passions, and, perhaps, exercise the ingenuity of the choleric and conceited dogmatist, but which are little calculated either to convince the judgment, or to rectify the conduct of the sincere and rational believer. They are usually undertaken by men who bring to the task as well the honesty to embrace truth, *wherever* it is to be found, as the ability to examine it, when it is to be found with *difficulty*, and who are therefore prepared, like the best philosophers of antiquity, et refellere sine pertinaciâ et refelli sine iracundiâ. — Imperfections, doubtless, and even inconsistencies, may be discovered by a searching eye in men of the most

cultivated understandings, and the most benevolent hearts—but where?—I boldly ask the keenest observer of human nature, and the fiercest enemy of ecclesiastical establishments—where is the prelate who has presumed to persecute a brother-clergyman, or, who in the most unguarded moments of debate, has dropped the slightest hint in favour of persecution? In reality, the mild and heavenly temper which breathes through the works of Hoadley, has spread its auspicious influence over the minds of those who *do*, and of those who *do not*, adopt his speculative opinions.

If this change (for I confess it to be such) is ascribed to the improved manners of the age, let not the clergy be excluded from all share in an improvement to which their own literary labours have *eminently* contributed; nor let their moderation be imputed merely to the sordid fear of acting ill, when it may proceed from the more generous ambition of acting well. In their academical education the minds of our clergy are not heated, like those of our forefathers, with the rage of party. Many of them withdraw occasionally from the solitude of a college, to enlarge their views and to refine their sentiments amidst the activity and elegance of common life. In their academical studies they have left the thorny and crooked mazes of scholastic learning, in order to pursue the sublime speculations of mathematics and natural philosophy, or to expatiate in the softer and more captivating scenes of polite literature. They are encouraged not to shrink from the most rigorous and profound researches into the reasons

of their faith; and instead of wasting their attention upon frivolous and barren subjects, those ἐρωτήσεις ἀπόρους καὶ λόγους ἀκανθώδεις, (as Lucian calls them,) where sophists wrangle and sciolists declaim, they are rather accustomed to look up to Christianity under the awful and majestic form of a religion, which is ultimately designed to comprehend within its promises and its laws the collective interests of mankind. I say not that they are totally superior to influence from the advantages and honours which the church holds out to them, and which are often incentives to industry, and the rewards to genius; but I say confidently, that they earn those honours with less servility to their superiors, less stiffness in their opinions, and far less intolerance to their antagonists than may be laid to the charge of their predecessors.

For my part, I wish not to varnish over those defects which in the estimation of its sincerest well-wishers and noblest ornaments, may yet adhere to our establishment. I disdain to flatter any man, however elevated be his station, and however brilliant his talents. But the veneration which I feel, and shall ever be zealous to avow for the honour of our church, has induced me to throw out the preceding observations; and for the truth of them I appeal to the theological writings of a Lowth and a Shipley, of Newcombe and Porteus, of Watson and Law. It were easy for me to lengthen the catalogue by the names of many among the inferior and higher orders of clergy, who, uniting zeal for their cause with candour to their opponents, have

employed their abilities in explaining the principles of natural religion, and in vindicating the evidences of revealed. But these excellent men can receive no lustre from my feeble praise—already they have obtained the approbation of every reader, whom it is an honour to please; and to the latest posterity their example, I trust, will be instructive, and their memory, for ever, dear.

Into this train of reflection I am led by the peevish sarcasms of certain fashionable writers, who have set up, I know not what, exclusive claims to every social virtue, and to every literary accomplishment, to the urbanity of scholars, and the impartiality of philosophers. But these men give no very honourable proofs of their sincerity, when they measure their own importance by the degradation of an order of men, in consequence of whose exertions religion and learning have been rescued from false refinement, placed upon the broadest foundations, and applied to the most salutary purposes.

The spirit of intolerance, whether it be leagued with the haughtiness of philosophy, or the zeal of religion, is equally disgraceful to us as men, and injurious to us as citizens. At the beginning of this century, our indignation was roused by the cry of heresy and schism. In the present age our ears are stunned with complaints of priestly cunning and of priestly power. He that formerly expressed a doubt upon the darkest, and perhaps the most unimportant parts of religion, was openly charged with being a Latitudinarian, and secretly suspected of being a Deist. He that admits the most plain and useful

of its doctrines, is now insulted with insinuations of the weakest folly, or the most flagitious hypocrisy. For these outrages against decency and justice the religionist found a plea in his imaginary orthodoxy, and the philosopher does not find a check against them in his boasted liberality. Experience, indeed, has not yet told us to what extent the spirit of persecution would be carried, if the means of persecuting were possessed by the enemies of genuine Christianity. But the virulence of their reproaches is no favourable omen for the candour of their actions; and, surely, the causes, which have operated in the defence of perverted religion, are likely to act with the same intenseness, and the same virulence in the support of irreligion. Even greater violence may be requisite to enforce opinions from which the human mind naturally revolts with distrust and horror, than to establish sentiments of the Deity, which, however obscured by error, and debased by superstition, are, upon the whole, congenial to the nature of man. Indifference to abstract tenets by no means implies a calm and upright neutrality towards the persons who adopt or oppose them. The pride of opinion is not less active on subjects of philosophy than upon those of religion; and "the secret incredulity" to which Mr. Hume ascribes the bigotry and the violence of professed believers, may find its way to the bosoms and the conduct of men, who erect their claims to superior wisdom upon the ruins of their faith.

Page 126.—*Liberty.*

Liberty is a splendid object. The love of liberty is a passion on the very eccentricities of which every virtuous man will look with pity and almost with veneration, while it is unmixed with the rancour of faction, or the selfishness of ambition. But there are weaknesses, and even corruptions of the human mind, which assume the specious appearance of that passion, and yet possess none of its nobler qualities. Hence many boast of their attachment to freedom, when they are really actuated by an untameable fierceness of temper, by a wanton propensity to change, by a lurking lust of power, and by that restless impatience of subordination, which is generated by pride, and rankles into malignity. To such persons every true friend of his country will apply the well-known maxim of Cato, "cum pares fieri superiores esse cœperint." He will view them with a watchful eye, while they are destined to walk in the humbler stations of society; and he will take a just alarm when he finds that they can terrify the higher as well as inflame the lower classes of men, and that they climb from popularity ill-gotten to power which is seldom employed well. The government for which they contend is not far removed from a total change of the constitution. For whatever professions they may hold out, and whatever subterfuges they may employ, there is reason to fear that their ultimate view is to rule, rather than to obey. Under this description may be included the

greater part of those persons who are called by Rapin "Republican Whigs." At the same time I most seriously deplore that harsh spirit of accusation which brands every warm and resolute advocate for liberty with the odious name of republican. These accusers, while they speak a different language, are, I suspect, influenced by the same motives with those persons to whom alone they ought to impute any flagitious design of subverting the state. The haughty high-flyer would contract liberty—the turbulent republican affects to enlarge it—but the real wish of both is, that they may be themselves exempted from control, and invested with the power of controling others.

Montesquieu, and many other able writers on Legislation, have combated the vulgar error, that a democracy is always the best, and a monarchy always the worst species of government. Bever, in his admirable observations on the Roman Polity, produces from Don Cassius a very sensible remark on the different modes of government:—"However flattering a popular government may appear in the eyes of the visionary advocates of natural equality, it has been found, by repeated experience, to contain no properties really correspondent to its name. Monarchy, on the contrary, terrible as it may be to the ear, is not without its advantages to society." P. 198.— In this country, happily, we are not yet reduced to the sad necessity of exposing ourselves to the evils either of a monarchical, or a democratical government, in their unmixed forms.

It is a most fatal error to suppose that the

greatest degree of liberty, as some men understand it, is upon the whole the best. On the contrary, we are authorised by the opinions of the ablest writers, and by the experience of the most celebrated states, to affirm, that liberty has often been destroyed in consequence of the measures that were employed to strengthen and to extend it.

By the lex Hortentia the Plebiscita were invested with the full force of laws, an event, upon which Bever makes these pertinent reflections; "this injudicious aggrandizement of the lowest order of the state, at the expence of all the rest, together with a too promiscuous communication of the highest honours and offices which soon followed, however flattering it might have been to plebeian vanity, gave a most fatal wound to the true interests of the community in general. The influence of the Senate being thus abridged, and the deference to the provident counsels of the better sort greatly diminished, the blind and giddy multitude broke loose into every extravagance of boundless liberty. Intoxicated with the excess of faction, they became the easy tools of their designing and ambitious demagogues, who having at first employed them to subdue their own rivals and antagonists, in the end made slaves of them all. The primitive constitution, thus lost to its original virtue and purity, grown unwieldy, and fatigued with all those vicissitudes and distractions which are so naturally appendant to this tumultuous and imperfect form of government, sunk, at last, with its own weight, into the arms of military and arbitrary power."—Bever, p. 79.

"May this melancholy and effecting example humble the insolence of republican licentiousness! May it point out to all factious opposers of lawful authority, the very thin partitions which divide the extremes of liberty from the extremes of tyranny; and convince them, that without the restraint, no less than the protection of regular government, men would daily worry and devour each other, like the savage beasts of the desert! May it dispose them to look with reverence, duty, and gratitude, to that constitution of which they are members; a constitution that is the pride of civil policy; and under whose wise and benign auspices they must be their own greatest enemies if they do not enjoy every blessing that man can reasonably expect in the compound and imperfect state of human society."—Ibid. p. 102.

The consequences of an injudicious and extravagant zeal for freedom are most forcibly described by Plato in the eighth book de Republica:

Ἆρ' οὖν καὶ ὃ δημοκρατία ὁρίζεται ἀγαθὸν, ἡ τούτου ἀπληστία καὶ ταύτην καταλύει. Λέγεις δ' αὐτὴν τί ὁρίζεσθαι; τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, εἶπον· τοῦτο γάρ που ἐν δημοκρατουμένῃ πόλει ἀκούσαις ἂν ὡς ἔχει τε κάλλιστον, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἐν μόνῃ ταύτῃ ἄξιον οἰκεῖν ὅστις φύσει ἐλεύθερος—Λέγεται γὰρ δή (ἔφη) καὶ πολὺ τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα. Ἆρ' οὖν (ἦν δ' ἐγὼ) ὅπερ ἦα νῦν δὴ ἐρῶν, ἡ τοῦ τοιούτου ἀπληστία, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἄλλων ἀμέλεια, καὶ ταύτην τὴν πολιτείαν μεθίστησί τε καὶ παρασκευάζει τυραννίδος δεηθῆναι; Πῶς; ἔφη· ὅταν (οἶμαι) δημοκρατουμένη πόλις, ἐλευθερίας διψήσασα, κακῶν οἰνοχόων προστατούντων τύχῃ καὶ πορρωτέρω τοῦ δέοντος ἀκράτου

αὐτῆς μεθυσθῇ, τοὺς ἄρχοντας δή, ἂν μὴ πάνυ πρᾷοι ὦσι, καὶ πολλὴν παρέχωσι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, κολάζει, αἰτιωμένη, ὡς μιαρούς τε καὶ ὀλιγαρχικούς.—Δρῶσι γὰρ (ἔφη) τοῦτο—Τοὺς δέ γε (εἶπον) τῶν ἀρχόντων κατηκόους προπηλακίζει, ὡς ἐθελοδούλους τε καὶ οὐδὲν ὄντας, τοὺς δὲ ἄρχοντας μὲν ἀρχομένοις, ἀρχομένους δὲ ἄρχουσιν ὁμοίους ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ δημοσίᾳ ἐπαινεῖ τε καὶ τιμᾷ. ἆρ' οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἐν τοιαύτῃ πόλει ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἰέναι;—Plat. de Repub. lib. VIII. vol. II. p. 206, edit. Massey.

I cannot offend the man of learning by bringing the whole of this passage to his remembrance; and, for the sake of the unlearned reader, I wish it were in my power to convey to him the exquisite beauties of the original through the medium of a translation.

PAGE 129.—*Establishments.*

The episcopalians have abandoned many of the illiberal prejudices, and much of that controversial acrimony, which prevailed in the beginning of this century. Upon principles of justice, therefore, as well as of policy, they should meet with candid and respectful treatment from those who neither hold their opinions nor approve of their discipline. There is no reason, indeed, for charging the more rational and learned of the non-conformists, either with insidious views of subverting the church, or with personal animosity towards the sincere and enlightened members of it.

The general question respecting establishments has been lately agitated with great warmth and great

ability. To engage in a formal and plenary defence of establishments falls not within the limited compass and more immediate design of these notes. After a serious and diligent attention to the subject, I am led by reasons of public utility to declare myself a most decided advocate for a national church; and for reasons of the same kind I should wish to see it erected upon the broadest and most comprehensive plan. Thus I should despise the narrowness and detest the intolerance of a system, which admitting the Socinian should exclude the Athanasian. But I should venerate the wisdom and the generosity of an establishment, into which the Pelagian and the Predestinarian might be allowed to enter, without the necessity of declaring their sentiments, without the power of defending them in a controversial form from the pulpit, and without the slightest restraints from declaring and defending them through the medium of the press.

By reducing the number, and changing the form of doctrinal points, by substituting intelligible terms for confused ideas, by excluding the obscure jargon which philosophy has introduced, and by employing the simpler language in which the scriptures are written, we might avoid the supposed inconveniences of a subscription, either to articles as they are now framed, or to the Bible *only*.—"Non enim pietas subtiles arduarum et difficilium quæstionum disceptatores, et curiosos latentium et abditarum rerum investigatores, sed simplices verissimi verbi, hoc est, mortui et resuscitati Christi Professores, et fidos voluntatis suæ executores requirit."

—G. Cassander de officio pii et Publicæ Tranquillitatis verè Amantis Viri, page 29.

Between dogmatism, which decides too much, and latitudinarianism, which confounds all distinctions, there is a middle point where good men may safely rest, and which candid men may easily find. There is a spirit, which by moderation is able to multiply the friends of the church, and by firmness to counteract the designs of its enemies. There is a possibility, at least, for wise and good men to unite in constructing a system with precision sufficient to secure the great interests of religious truth—with discrimination sufficient to accomplish all the purposes of political utility—and with purity sufficient to give the Church of England a decisive superiority over every establishment and every sect which have hitherto appeared in the Christian world. Under such a system we might look for that peace which Bacon has so beautifully described. "It establishes faith, it kindleth charity, the outward peace of the church distilleth into peace of conscience, and it turneth the labours of writing and reading controversies into treatises of mortification and devotion." We should be rescued from the false unities which the same writer thus laments: "The one is when the peace is grounded upon an implicit ignorance, for all colours will agree in the dark; the other when it is pieced up upon a direct admission of contraries in fundamental points." But these surely are few and simple; they require little explanation, and admit little controversy.

When the artless perspicuity of scripture is over-

laid by the abstruse subtilties of metaphysics—when reason either refines away what is made clear, or dogmatizes on what is left doubtful by Omniscience — when ceremonies, which ought to adorn religion, engender a motley brood of doctrines, which deform and disgrace it—it is to be feared, assent will often be professed without conviction, and conformity often practised without approbation. —"Truth and falsehood," as Bacon says, "would then become like the iron and clay in the toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image—they might cleave; but would not incorporate."

At present I shall say nothing farther as to the general merits of a question on which I have bestowed no inconsiderable share of attention, and have collected a larger stock of materials than my professional engagements will now permit me to arrange. I must, however, take the liberty of examining some new arguments which have lately appeared against the utility of ecclesiastical establishments, and which, from the high character and extensive circulation of the work which contains them, deserve to be seriously considered.

The Appendix to the English Review is conducted by a writer whose acuteness of observation, and energy of diction, lift him far above the vulgar herd of political declaimers. I shall, therefore, place his arguments in his own words before the reader, that I may not be accused either of misrepresenting their tendency, or of disordering their arrangement.— "The Emperor, as a preparation for extending his temporal dominions, fills his coffers by encroaching

on the church, The bold spirt of innovation in matters relating to religion, has continued to produce new effects since the times of Martin Luther to the present. The conduct of the Emperor is an important effect of this spirit—other effects will follow in the course of time—all hierarchies, in the present daring age, have reason to tremble—unprotected by religious veneration and awe, the riches of the church prove a tempting bait to the unhallowed views of state policy—the example of America too, will operate towards the same end—for that continent will prove the fallacy of the doctrine, that no state can subsist without an established religion — an unlimited toleration will make as many religions as there are families; and it is to be apprehended that a very great indifference to all religion will be the consequence — the world will laugh at the pretensions of the priests more than ever—the spirit of reform in England will at last reach the church—the Bishop of Landaff advises to take from the rich clergy and give to the poor—politicians will improve on his plan, perhaps, and discover from the records of civil and sacred history, that pomp and parade accord not with the humility of the gospel, and that the purity of Christianity is ever best maintained amidst poverty, and various other sufferings and hardships." — English Review for July, 1783, page 78.

How far it may be an instance of sound morality to seize on the revenues which belong to the church, and which are fastened to it by the strongest ties which can confer security on civil property — whe-

ther it be consistent with political wisdom to pamper laymen in luxury, by the aid of treasures, which, if judiciously dispensed, are barely sufficient to furnish a decent support to the clergy — what probability there may be that men of talents will continue in an establishment which holds out no incentives to industry, and no distinctions to genius —these are points of which I at present waive the discussion. If in the spirit of reform, "which is at last to reach the church," nothing more be implied than is explicitly allowed — if only the advice of an illustrious prelate be followed "in taking from the rich and giving to the poor"—if the improvement of politicians upon his plan produce nothing beyond the discovery, "that pomp and parade accord not with the humility of the gospel," I am not in the number of those timorous and grovelling spirits who tremble at the prospect of *impending* reformation. If the "religious veneration and awe" to which the author alludes be the offspring of abject superstition— and if the church be found unworthy of protection on the more solid grounds of public utility, who would be senseless or shameless enough to stand forth the champion of so despicable an establishment? Again, if the "pretensions of priests, at which the world is to laugh more than ever," be confined to the right of deceiving and of plundering, let the richest spoils of usurpation be plucked from them, and let their characters be hunted down by all the infamy which is due to detected imposture. Upon these tragical consequences I smile with calm content, because the premises from which they flow are in this country incapable of proof.

"The purity of Christianity," we are told, "is ever best maintained amidst poverty, and various other sufferings and hardships." This position may be justly doubted, and the purpose for which it is here introduced may be as justly suspected. Suppose that any statesman is convinced of its truth, and that he goes forward to such measures as are tacitly recommended, or, at least, such as may be amply justified upon the principles which the Reviewer would establish — suppose that in consequence of his ardent wishes to preserve the purity of the gospel even from the slightest taint, our politician should deliver all good Christians from the embarrassments of their property, depress them below other citizens, to whom they are superior in virtue and in knowledge, and ravish from them all the comforts and the privileges of social life. Let us farther suppose, that he was impelled to make them miserable here, from the professed *design* of enabling them more effectually to work out their own salvation hereafter. Perhaps some humane and sensible observers might think that his apprehensions of hierarchy, and his love of Christianity, had carried him beyond the bounds of strict prudence. His regard for toleration would be a little problematical to the unhappy sufferers, and his policy, though very profound in the eyes of men who are guided by the superior light of philosophy, would be very unintelligible to those who are content to creep along under the weak and humble direction of common sense. His zeal in defending Christianity by these methods would soon be at an

end through the paucity of its objects; for I imagine that the candidates for such distinctions would not be numerous; and though the heroic fortitude of a few might support them under the trying loss of every temporal advantage, the many would be satisfied with his less valuable favours, and would be more grateful to him for his protection because they had no religion, than for his wholesome severities because they embraced what they believed to be true.

It is remarkable, that Mr. Jenyns, in his Defence of Revelation, and the Reviewer in his panegyric upon it, have fallen into the same train of ideas as to the advantages which Christianity derives from the poverty, the insignificance, and the distresses of its followers. To the paradoxes of the essayist, and the sarcasms of the reviewer, I shall oppose the plain good sense of Hoadley.

"But it is a sad thing to find men endeavouring to represent the Christian religion as teaching men to throw off all care about the happiness of human society, and to look upon themselves as unconcerned in the outward good estate of their families, their neighbours, and their posterity; and all this, merely because it was thought necessary by the great author of it, to lay down some precepts in it against regarding the temporal things of this life above God and our duty. This must make people apt to believe it an enemy, and not a friend to human society."—Measures of Submission, &c. page 145.

The conduct of the Emperor is represented as an important effect of the bold spirit of innovation,

"which has produced new effects from the time of Martin Luther to the present." In curbing the impetuous and inhuman spirit of persecution, and in sheltering every religious sect from insult as well as injury, the Emperor is to be commended as a man. He is not to be censured as a politician for applying to the real exigencies of the state that wealth, which swelled the pride, fostered the laziness, and extended the pernicious tyranny of ecclesiastics. Yet this sagacious politician seems to have hitherto proceeded, not with the blind and daring fury of an innovator, but with the discriminating and temperate genius of a true reformer. He is not so far fascinated by the hardy spirit of enterprise as to rush on the perilous experiment of subverting a religion which the piety of his forefathers had established, and the majority of his subjects embraced. He has not yet soared up to those sublime and magnificent theories which represent true Christianity as quite incompatible with the duties and the interests of civil society, and as adapted only to the sullen gloom of the bigot, the rapturous extasies of the enthusiast, or the dull inactivity of the recluse. He has given to the Protestants the indulgence to which they have been long entitled. He has plucked from the Papists the opulence which they had long abused. He has shown his humanity in forbidding them to harass each other with virulent reproaches, and his good sense in excluding from the pulpit those controversial subjects which have no immediate tendency to improve the bulk of mankind, and which are likely to be discussed with better temper,

and with better effect, in the productions of the press. Yet in this celebrated event there are some particulars which a sober constitutionalist will survey with a jealous eye, and which ought to repress the triumphs of those, who, overlooking or suppressing many important distinctions, would hold up the conduct of the Emperor as worthy of imitation by a British legislature. In absolute monarchies the subjects are both relieved and oppressed with less difficulty, and with fewer delays, than in a mixed government. Uncontrolled by a watchful Parliament, supported by a numerous army, and opposed only by the murmurs of priests, the execrations of devotees, and the complaints of an astonished and defenceless multitude, the Emperor has, in the language of his encomiast, "filled his coffers by encroaching on the church."—A King of England, in the same circumstances, might, without danger to his crown, and almost without resistance from his people, effect the same encroachments. Under pretence of restraining ecclesiastical pride, and "preserving the gospel purity," he might scatter with wild profusion, or dispense with insidious policy, the revenues of the English church, among the unprincipled and unfeeling instruments of his rapacity his ambition, or his revenge. Is there, indeed, any change which he might not accomplish for the purposes of oppression, and, adding mockery to violence, dignify his plunders with the nickname of reform? The power which had crushed the church, might, in its career, press forward to more inviting objects. By one edict it might wrest from us all our civil

and political rights, and subvert by one blow the whole fabric of our ancient constitution.

The weakness of man, combined with his pride, misguides him in the choice of what he praises, and what he imitates. Impatience under imaginary evils plunges him into those which are real—unskilfulness in remedying the real frequently overwhelms him with other evils more heavy, more extensive, and more incurable. Alarmed, therefore, at the eagerness of my countrymen to pursue every phantom of novelty, sensible of the dazzling appearance which the supposed proceedings both of the Congress and the Emperor will bear to common observers, and foreseeing the use to which these precedents will be applied by those of them who do not perceive the fallaciousness of their own reasonings, I have examined in various points of view the peremptory assertions and specious arguments of this very masterly writer.

"The example of America," we are informed, "will prove the fallacy of the doctrine that no state can subsist without an established religion." Now, the fact itself is not to be hastily admitted, and though admitted, ought to be cautiously applied. If the Americans possess the uncommon sagacity which is ascribed to them by their admirers, and which has, in many instances, been successfully employed by them, amidst the difficulties and the dangers of a lingering war, they will not lavish upon experiments in religion, that skill, which may be more profitably exercised upon other matters, where it is more immediately required. Looking back to

the states of Europe, they will find something to follow as well as to avoid, in their own religious institutions.—" Before the United Provinces set the example, toleration was deemed incompatible with good government; and it was thought impossible, that a number of religious sects could live together in harmony and peace, and have all of them an equal attachment to their common country, and to each other." Hume's Essays, vol. I. page 13.

In the conduct of this republic, the Americans may find an unequivocal proof that toleration is not inconsistent with an establishment, and that both are consistent with the public welfare—in the modifications of both they may introduce many improvements which European wisdom has not yet suggested, and which European refinements do not admit.

The early and rooted prepossessions of the Americans are unfavourable to the gaudy trappings of an hierarchy. Their peculiar circumstances may allow, and their unprejudiced judgments approve of, a more enlarged and regular toleration, than the limited monarchies of Europe, however liberal be their spirit, and however comprehensive their views, have hitherto ventured to adopt. But they may still find one mode of religion in a practical as well as a speculative light, preferable to another—and accordingly, we are told, they have already given a preference to the presbyterian form of worship, providing for the security of those who dissent from it,

But I will not suffer my mind to rove in conjectures about what the Americans may do, nor shall

I assert positively what they have done. I will for a moment admit the fact to be as the Reviewer has stated it. What consequences must we draw for the regulation of our own conduct? From a government which is just beginning to be formed, to those which have already been formed for many ages, and which are strengthened not only by the authority of law, but by the firmer support of long habit and public opinion, we ought to be extremely wary in our conclusions. May not that be safe and eligible in the one, which is dangerous or even impracticable in the other? Has the event hitherto shown that which is attempted by the Americans is upon the whole more salutary, than what is practised by ourselves? A century may roll on before the effects of such an attempt are fully produced—when produced, they may be indistinctly understood —when understood, they may require to be applied with many and important restrictions.

It is possible, that the seductive charms of novelty may operate upon the mind even of an American legislator, and render him insensible or inattentive to the advantages which prescription, which custom and conformity to the national genius have conferred upon the religious institutions of Europe. The benefits arising from reformation are glaring and prominent; they burst out at one particular point of time; they relate to subjects which the activity of controversialists has accurately ascertained; they are exhibited in the strongest language of exultation and panegyric. But the advantages of an establishment are more familiar, more diffusive, gained

without effort, possessed without interruption, and, therefore, like other materials of our happiness, they rarely become the objects of direct and steady attention, even among those by whom they are really enjoyed.

The Americans are spread over an immense tract of country—they are discriminated by many striking differences in their domestic habits, and their religious tenets; from the variety of interests and of manners which must arise from the various climates and soils, they will be able, and probably willing, to act independently of each other in the internal regulations of the several provinces—what is perfectly fit among a people thus circumstanced, may be big with the most fatal consequences in European countries, where the circumstances both of public and private life are so very dissimilar. But I will no longer persecute this position of the Re viewer with the rigours of confutation — let me rather commend him for his fair dealing, because he has himself furnished a more cogent reason than any which I have produced, for condemning all the experiments which he has applauded in the Americans, and for guarding against all the innovations which he has predicted concerning ourselves. "Unlimited toleration will make as many religions as there are families; and it is to be apprehended, that a very great indifference to all religion will be the consequence." The Eng. Rev. for July, 1783, p. 78. —Upon this ingenuous and rational concession the professed advocates of an establishment will readily join issue with its most determined enemies.

Whether atheism or superstition be most destructive to a state, is a question which has often exercised the most vigorous and enlightened minds; but the wantonness of modern scepticism has not yet openly leagued itself with the hardiness of Epicurean impiety, and boldly pronounced all religion whatsoever to be injurious to society. If, therefore, establishments controuled and softened by toleration prevent indifference to religion, they are useful—if toleration, disdaining even the remotest connections with establishments produce and diffuse that indifference, it is pernicious.

The last sheet of Rapin on Whigs and Tories is not in the reprint of Dr. Parr; but the following unpublished observations follow up the subject of establishments so properly and naturally, that they are now copied from the manuscript.

Uniformity Tests and Sects.

Uniformity of opinion is a project, which the constitution of the human mind, and the experience of all ages, have at length compelled us to abandon. Even the enthusiast despairs of obtaining, and the politician is ashamed of attempting it. What

cannot be accomplished, need not be desired. There are many points which the most rigorous and watchful establishment cannot embrace. There are few probably on which any ought to divide; yet both furnish ample materials, not merely for the gratification of curiosity or the display of acuteness, but for the noblest exercise of our understandings, and the most solid improvement of our morals. The advantages of reformation are glaring and prominent; they are collected into one point of time, and are exhibited in the strongest language of exultation and panegyric. The benefits of an establishment are more familiar, more diffusive, and therefore, like other materials of our happiness, are seldom the objects of direct and steady attention, among those by whom they are really enjoyed.

Impatience of contradiction in these remote and sublime speculations, always suggests suspicion that men do not clearly comprehend, or entirely believe, what they zealously maintain. Uniformity, if it ever exist, will probably be the result of gross ignorance, or unfeeling indifference; it gives stability to error, and shuts out the knowledge of many useful truths; it is seldom successful in stifling the first rise of new opinions, and when they have gained any ground, inflames the heat of those who adopt them.

The wise legislator cannot compel men to think, and will not endeavour to compel them to profess what they do not believe. He respects the authority of

reason in religious matters, and therefore leaves others the same liberty of opinion with himself. He respects its authority no less in civil concerns, and therefore guards both his own opinions and those of his fellow-citizens from mutual violence. He does not discourage inquiry, but he prohibits invective and outrage.

I have observed, with some concern, that the solid conveniences arising from tests are slightly noticed by those who in the darkest colours hold out the inconveniences attending them; and I fairly confess my inability to conceive an establishment without a test, or a national religion without an establishment. I make this declaration with the greatest sincerity, and am prepared to retract it with equal sincerity, when the contrary opinion, supported by clear facts, and not decorated only by plausible theory, shall meet me in the course of my inquiry. I have no object in view but the discovery of truth, and the promotion of public utility; nor do I put up any pretensions to merit in keeping my mind open to conviction upon those interesting subjects, where obstinacy surely is the most wretched weakness, and dissimulation the blackest crime.

If it be intended to leave the numerous sects of believers in the quiet possession of their tenets, and to relieve them from the tyranny of religious tests, they now enjoy all the freedom which the abolition of the establishment could procure, and they probably derive some advantages from that

diligence in their studies, and that circumspection in their morals, by which smaller bodies of men may honourably exalt their importance.

I should always wish the Church to possess the confidence and respect of sectarians, and that the Dissenters may be exempted from the slightest degree of that odium which is equally painful to ingenuous and well-informed minds with the rigours of persecution. I am persuaded that the essential doctrine, the vital spirit, the peculiar and characteristic genius of Christianity, have no immediate connection with the arbitrary and accidental forms of human government. I am firmly convinced that every mode of faith is equally entitled to the protection, but not to the favour of Government. When that protection is given, the rights of conscience must no longer be urged or pleaded in a spirit or as a cause of discontent.

I am not to be told that in these remarks I have assumed the propriety of establishments, without adverting to proofs. These proofs are to be found, not in the express directions of Christianity, but in the general practice of society; in the right which every body of men have to choose their own modes of worship, and to provide for the members of it; and in the importance of holding together the majority by a fixed principle of religion, or of opposition to those who deny the right of any government to appoint to religious services, and to sustain them by certain rewards.

The utility of the establishment is already decided

by experience, and it is perhaps by the silent growth of toleration, and the actual enjoyment of its blessings, that we are enabled to carry forward our speculations to a more extensive and liberal system, which our posterity shall find practicable as well as rational.

This indulgence it were frenzy to extend to any sect who boldly avowed its contempt of some social duties, or its opposition to the civil power. It were frenzy to endure for a moment a spirit too fierce to be soothed, and too perverse to be converted by expostulation; such monstrous opinions are beneath the question. But it will be said that all speculation indirectly and remotely affects practice: this is generally but not universally true, and in many cases where the object is too vast to be grasped by our intellectual faculties, or too trivial to endure their touch, the mischief arises not immediately from the opinion itself, but incidentally from the temper with which it is promulgated—from the pride which is impatient of confutation—and from that controversial babble which affects to bestow importance on trifles; and in vain shall we look for a solution which the assertion itself neither furnishes nor assists us to obtain. From the imperfect condition of man, and the very complex circumstances in which he is sometimes placed, truth is not always productive of virtue, nor error of vice. But were it otherwise, who shall presume always to decide where the truth lies; and, connecting the actions of men with their sentiments,

determine their social rights by the standard of their speculative tenets? If the heart be vitiated by the understanding, by the understanding also it must be purified; and surely the proper remedy would be, not force, but instruction; not punishment, which appals, but arguments, which may convince; not severities, which exact only a servile and precarious conformity, but conviction, which produces an inward, a sincere, and steady effort in the assent of the judgment and the concurrence of the will. It must be owned that the wild and rash decisions of fanaticism have a tendency to produce such actions as are inconsistent with the public peace and security. But when we look further we may observe that many of these things are seen only through the medium of theory. In many of their debated actions, men are much on a level with their fellows; and if the warmest admirers of virtue are not always virtuous, so the admirers of tenets which seem akin to vice, are not always vicious. The truth is, that men are governed by the impulse of the past; and the force of that passion may depend upon present circumstances which are not provided for in their general system of opinion, or by their natural constitutions, which their tenets, and the habits generated by them, are unable to controul. As in their opinions they disdain the consequences which simply follow from their premises, so in their conduct their consciences will come in and make them revolt from actions to which their principles, abstractedly considered, may

seem to lead them. On such occasions they are terrified, and either discover new energies, or feel only a momentary shock; and their minds, by a kind of hidden force rush back to their favourite opinions, which they retain with equal zeal while heated to obduracy, and which they abandon with equal eagerness when surprised into truth by the sudden springs of their better sensibilities.

The danger arising from the influence of opinions is therefore so remote, that a wise and steady magistracy has little to apprehend from it, and is so secret in its operations that no rules can be laid down for calculating its effects. To counteract it lenient measures are more likely to be efficacious than those which are violent, for it is scarcely possible to fix the proportion between the malignity of the disease and the sharpness of the remedy. Let me not be suspected of that frantic position, that all opinions are really beneficial as opinions; a position which is confuted by the experience of every moment, and which no one but the dupe of artificial subtleties has seriously broached as a truth in the intercourse of serious life.

In what then consists the duty of the legislature? To encourage some, to depress others, to watch all, and to injure none; on all occasions to prefer lenity to rigour, and in the infliction of punishment to distinguish between profligacy and weakness. If mere propensity to action be a ground for evil, society itself must be instantly dissolved, or it could be supported only on the sanguinary principles of

Draco—of Japan. Not to opinions which, though erroneous, may be harmless, but to those offences which are always hurtful, and which may be always ascertained with precision, does the business of the magistrate extend. Where there are men there will be passions, "vitia erunt donec homines: sed neque hæc continua meliorum interventu pensantur."

END OF VOLUME III.

Printed by J. B. Nichols and Son, 25, Parliament-street.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

Form 410